

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1986 Convention

Proceedings



**80th Annual Convention
January 13-15, 1986
New Orleans, Louisiana**

Table of Contents

I. Register 1986

Administrative Organization 1-5

Convention Delegates, Visitors and V

II. Proceedings of the 80th NCAA Con

Opening General Session 1

Chancellor Remarks 1

Convention Committees 1

Report of the Council 1

Report of Memorial Resolution Committee 1

Division I-A Rules 1

Proposed Amendments 1

Recomm. Council 1

Division I-A Criteria 1

Limitations on TV 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

Academic 1

Division I-A-A Budget 1

Proposed Amendments 1

Recruiting 1

Football 1

Division I-A-A Budget 1

Division I-B 1

Proposed Amendments 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

NCAA 1986-87 Budget 1

Academic 1

Eligibility—Initial Qualification 1

Recomm. Council 1

More for Faculty 1

Division I-C 1

Division I-C 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

Eligibility—Initial Qualification 1

Graduate Assistant Committee 1

for Hockey Program 1

Division II Programs 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

Eligibility—Initial Qualification 1

Graduate Assistant Committee 1

for Hockey Program 1

Division III Programs 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

Eligibility—Initial Qualification 1

Graduate Assistant Committee 1

for Hockey Program 1

Division IV Programs 1

Review of Proposed Amendments 1

Eligibility—Initial Qualification 1

Graduate Assistant Committee 1

for Hockey Program 1

Proceedings

of the

80th Annual Convention



of the

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Hilton Riverside and Towers

New Orleans, Louisiana

January 13-15, 1986

© 1985 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced without written permission from the
National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1986	
Administrative Organization	7
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	24
II. Proceedings of the 80th NCAA Convention	
Opening General Session	47
Opening Remarks	47
Convention Committees	48
Report of the Council	49
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	51
Division I-A Business Session	54
Proposed Amendments	54
Recruiting Contacts	54
Division I-A Criteria	54
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	57
Review of Proposed Amendments	57
Academics	58
Division I-AA Business Session	60
Proposed Amendments	60
Recruiting Contacts	60
Football Coaching Staff	61
Division I-AAA Business Session	63
Division I Business Session	65
Proposed Amendments	65
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	65
Satisfactory Progress	69
Academic Reporting	70
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	70
Recruiting Contacts and Visitations	75
Men's Ice Hockey Recruiting	75
Division I Criteria	76
Division I Criteria	76
Seasons of Competition	76
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	77
Graduate Assistant Coaches	79
Ice Hockey Playing Seasons	79
Division II Business Session	81
Review of Proposed Amendments	81
Consent Packages	81
Academics	81
Presidents Commission Grouping	82
Financial Aid	84
General	85
Recruiting	86
Membership and Classification	89
Eligibility	90
Waivers	91
Review of Proposed Amendments	91
Playing and Practice Seasons	91



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201
913/384-3220
August 1986

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Continuation of Division II Business Session	94
Review of Proposed Amendments	94
Playing and Practice Seasons	94
Governance	96
Proposed Amendments	99
Division II Criteria	99
Limitations on Number of Contests	99
Division III Business Session	100
Acceptance of Reports	100
Block-Grant Funding	100
Academics	100
Proposed Amendments	103
Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	103
Division III Criteria	104
Division III Criteria	104
Transfer Rule—Division III	107
Review of Proposed Amendments	107
Consent Packages	107
Presidents Commission Grouping	110
Financial Aid	111
General	111
Membership and Classification	111
Continuation of Division III Business Session	113
Review of Proposed Amendments	113
Consent Packages	113
Governances	116
Eligibility	117
Playing and Practice Seasons	118
Amateurism	118
Committee Reports	118
Special NCAA Self-Study Advisory Committee	118
Special NCAA Committee to Review Playing Rules	119
Block-Grant Funding	122
Honors Luncheon	129
General Business Session	145
Proposed Amendments	145
Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules	145
Consent Package—Bylaws, Others	145
Eligibility of Student-Athletes	146
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	147
Resolution: Enforcement and Compliance	149
Financial Aid Limitations	150
Financial Aid—Pell Grants	150
Financial Aid—Pell Grants	152
Financial Aid—Undergraduate Student-Athlete	153
Financial Aid—Summer School	153
Financial Aid—Established Awards	154
Financial Aid—Honorary Awards	154
Financial Aid—Equivalencies	155
Drug Testing	155
Resolution: Gambling	157

Legislative Proposals—Cost Estimates	157
Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	157
Track and Field	160
Seasons of Competition	161
Criteria for Conduct of Championships	161
Postseason Football Contests	161
Recruiting Contacts	162
Recruiting—Evaluation Visits	163
Letter of Intent	164
Recruiting Contacts	164
Resolution: Recruiting Contact Limits	164
Tryout Rule	165
Sports Camps, Coaching Schools and Clinics	165
Printed Recruiting Aids	165
Transportation to Campus	167
Self-Financed Visits—Transportation	167
Recruiting—Tryouts	169
Recruiting—Complimentary Admissions	169
Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement	169
Division I-A Criteria	170
Division I-A Criteria	170
Change of Division Membership	171
Championships Eligibility	173
Multidivision Classification	173
Multidivision Classification	173
Seasons of Competition	174
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	176
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	177
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	178
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	178
Transfer Rule—Residence Requirement	178
Junior College Transfer Student	179
Eligibility for Practice	179
Five-Year Rule	179
Convention Committees—Nominees	179
Voting—Ice Hockey	183
Amendments	183
High School or Junior College Representation on Sports Committees	184
Football Coaching Staff	184
Limitations on Playing Seasons and Numbers of Contests	185
Contest Limits—Fund-Raising Activities	185
Limitations on Playing Seasons	185
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	186
Postseason Football Contests	186
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	187
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	188
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	190
Permissible Expenses—Athletics Career Counseling	190
Amateurism—Agents	191
Drug Rehabilitation Expenses	191

Limitations on Numbers of Contests.....	193
Permissible Expenses—Career Counseling.....	194
Sports Festival Tryout Expenses.....	195
Commercial Logos	196
Report of Committees	197
III. Appendices	
A. Legislative Proposals	A- 1
B. Convention Committees	A-74
C. NCAA Convention Sites	A-76
D. Past and Present NCAA officers	A-77
E. Index to Legislative Proposals	A-79

NCAA Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

JOHN R. DAVIS

Department of Intercollegiate Athletics

Gill Coliseum

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

(Term Expires January 1987*)

Secretary-Treasurer

WILFORD S. BAILEY

Professor

Auburn University

224 Broun Hall

Auburn University, Alabama 36849-3501

(Term Expires January 1987*)

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street

P.O. Box 1906

Mission, Kansas 66201

Division I Vice-President: Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Higher Education Commission (Term Expires January 1987*)

Division II Vice-President: Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University (Term Expires January 1986*)

Division III Vice-President: Elizabeth A. Kruczak, Fitchburg State College (Term Expires January 1986*)

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division round table during the annual Convention. [Constitution 5-1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
William H. Baughn Acting Chancellor University of Colorado Campus Box 17 Boulder, Colorado 80309	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1986*
William D. Bradford, M.D. Professor of Pathology Duke University Box 3712, Dept. of Pathology Durham, North Carolina 27710	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
Richard W. Burns Professor of Teacher Education College of Education University of Texas El Paso, Texas 79968	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1986*
Eugene F. Corrigan Director of Athletics University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana 46556	I-A Independent North (Region 3)	Jan. 1988*
Joan Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee 115 Stokely Athletics Center Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3110	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1987
Lewis A. Cryer, Commissioner Pacific Coast Athletic Association 1700 E. Dyer Road, Suite 140 Santa Ana, California 92705	I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
D.J. DiJulia, Commissioner Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference One Lafayette Circle Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604	I-AAA (Region I)	1986 Convention
Jack V. Doland President McNees State University Ryan Street Lake Charles, Louisiana 70609	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Della Durant Assistant Director of Athletics Pennsylvania State University 204 Recreation Building University Park, Pennsylvania 16802	I-At Large (Region 1)	1986 Convention

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Mikki Flowers Associate Director of Athletics Old Dominion University Hampton Boulevard Norfolk, Virginia 23508	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
Thomas J. Frericks Vice-President; Dir. of Athletics University of Dayton 300 College Park Dayton, Ohio 45469	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1986*
Frederick Hemke Professor of Music Northwestern University School of Music Regenstein Hall Evanston, Illinois 60201	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Mary Alice Hill 10150 Campo Road Spring Valley, California 92077	I-At Large (Region 4)	1986 Convention
Cecil W. Ingram Director of Athletics Florida State University P.O. Box 2195 Tallahassee, Florida 32316	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	1986 Convention
David L. Maggard Director of Athletics University of California Memorial Stadium Berkeley, California 94720	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Andrew T. Mooradian Director of Men's Athletics University of New Hampshire Main Street Durham, New Hampshire 03824	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1986*
Sondra Norrell-Thomas Associate Director of Athletics Howard University Burr Gymnasium 6th and Girard Streets, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20059	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1987*
Arliss L. Roaden Executive Director Tennessee Higher Education Commission 501 Union Building, Suite 300 Nashville, Tennessee 37219	I-AA Central (Region 2)	1986 Convention

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires	Name, Institution	Term Expires
Vernon M. Smith Director of Athletics University of Toledo 2801 W. Bancroft Street Toledo, Ohio 43606	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*	Rudy Carvajal Director of Athletics California State University 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, California 93311 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
John E. Thomas Chancellor Appalachian State University Boone, North Carolina 28608	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*	Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University University Square Erie, Pennsylvania 16541 (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Kathleen M. Wear Assistant Director of Athletics LaSalle University 20th Street and Olney Avenue Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1986	Asa N. Green President Livingston University Livingston, Alabama 35470 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Law School Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*	Bob Moorman Commissioner Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association 2013 Cunningham Drive, Suite 241 Hampton, Virginia 23666 (Region 2)	Jan. 1986*

Division II

Name, Institution	Term Expires	Name, Institution	Term Expires
Louise Albrecht Associate Director of Athletics Southern Connecticut State University Pelz Gymnasium New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1)	1986 Convention	James R. Spalding Director of Athletics Bellarmine College Newburg Road Louisville, Kentucky 40205 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*
Joan Board Coordinator of Women's Athletics Grand Valley State College 187 Fieldhouse Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*	Ade L. Sponberg Director of Athletics North Dakota State University New Fieldhouse Fargo, North Dakota 58105 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Judith M. Brame Director of Women's Athletics California State University 18111 Nordhoff Northridge, California 91330 (Region 4)	Jan. 1986*	Richard B. Yoder Director of Athletics West Chester University of Pennsylvania West Chester, Pennsylvania 19383 (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*
Raymond M. Burse President Kentucky State University East Main Street Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*		

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division III

Name, Institution	Term Expires	Term Expires
Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College 3201 Burton Street, S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*	Jan. 1986*
Robert W. Hatch Department Chair and Director of Athletics Bates College Campus and Central Avenues Lewiston, Maine 04240 (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*	Jan. 1989*
Thomas M. Kinder Director of Athletics; Chair, Physical Education Dept. Bridgewater College East College Street Bridgewater, Virginia 22812 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*	Jan. 1987*
Elizabeth A. Kruczak Director of Athletics Fitchburg State College 160 Pearl Street Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420 (Region 1)	Jan. 1986*	Jan. 1986*
Mary Jean Mulvaney Chair, Department of Physical Education & Athletics University of Chicago 5640 South University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*	Jan. 1986*
A. P. Perkins Jr. President St. Andrews Presbyterian College 1700 Dogwood Mile Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*	Jan. 1989*
Russell J. Poel Professor of Chemistry North Central College Naperville, Illinois 60566 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*	Jan. 1989*
Robert T. Shields Director of Athletics Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison 285 Madison Avenue Madison, New Jersey 07940 (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*	Jan. 1989*
Judith M. Sweet Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego S-005 La Jolla, California 92093 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*	Jan. 1987*
Patricia A. Thompson Director of Athletics Elmira College Administration Building Elmira, New York 14901 (Region 2)	Jan. 1986*	Jan. 1986*
Elmer W. Yoest Director of Athletics Otterbein College Rike Center Westerville, Ohio 43081 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex-officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents automatically are members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for a term of five years. The terms of no more than two of the nine Council-elected members shall expire in any one year. [Constitution 5-2.]

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-A	Merrily Dean Baker Director, Women's Athletics University of Minnesota Bierman Building 516 15th Avenue S.E. Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455	Jan. 1987
I-A	Edward E. Bozik Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh P.O. Box 7436 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1990*
II	Connie Claussen Coordinator, Women's Athletics University of Nebraska, Omaha 60th and Dodge Streets Omaha, Nebraska 68182	Jan. 1988*
I-AAA	Robert H. Frailey Asst. to President Director of Athletics American University Washington, D.C. 20016	Jan. 1988*
I-A	Leanne Grotke Associate Director of Athletics California State University P156, 800 N. State College Fullerton, California 92634	Jan. 1990*
I-A	Fred Jacoby Commissioner Southwest Athletic Conference P.O. Box 47420 1300 West Mockingbird Lane, Suite 444 Dallas, Texas 75247	Jan. 1987*
III VP	Elizabeth A. Kruczek Director of Athletics Fitchburg State College 160 Pearl Street Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420	Jan. 1986*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-AA	Walter Reed Director of Athletics Jackson State University 1325 J.R. Lynch Street Jackson, Mississippi 39217	Jan. 1986*
I VP (I-AA)	Arliss L. Roaden Executive Director Tennessee Higher Education Commission 501 Union Building, Suite 300 Nashville, Tennessee 37219	Jan. 1987*
III	Robert F. Riedel Director of Athletics Geneseo State University College Geneseo, New York 14454	Jan. 1986*
I-A	Colonel Harvey W. Schiller Professor and Head, Department of Chemistry U.S. Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, Colorado 80840	Jan. 1989*
II VP	Ade L. Sponberg Director of Athletics North Dakota State University New Fieldhouse Fargo, North Dakota 58105	Jan. 1986*

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions. The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division. The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	<i>Term as Chair Expires</i>
Commission Chair: John W. Ryan, Indiana University, Bloomington	Jan. 1986*
Division I Chair: Otis A. Singletary, University of Kentucky	Jan. 1986*
Division II Chair: Barbara J. Seelye, Keene State College	Jan. 1986*
Division III Chair: Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)	Jan. 1986*

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Duane Acker President Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*
Lattie F. Coor President University of Vermont, Waterman Bldg. Burlington, Vermont 05405	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1986
Pope A. Duncan President Stetson University De Land, Florida 32720	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Edward B. Fort Chancellor North Carolina A&T State University 1601 East Market Street Greensboro, North Carolina 27411	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1986
Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn President St. Peter's College Jersey City, New Jersey 07306	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*
I.M. Heyman Chancellor University of California Berkeley, California 94720	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1986

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Jeffrey R. Holland President Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Eugene M. Hughes President Northern Arizona University Box 4092 Flagstaff, Arizona 86011	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Noah N. Langdale Jr. President Georgia State University University Plaza Atlanta, Georgia 30303	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*
William E. Lavery President Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Peter Likins President Lehigh University Alumni Memorial Building 27 Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Stanley E. McCaffrey President University of the Pacific Stockton, California 95211	I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
Very Rev. J. Donald Monan President Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Herb F. Reinhard President Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky 40351	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1987
John W. Ryan President Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana 47405	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1988*
Michael Schwartz President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires	
Otis A. Singletary President University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky 40506	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*	
John B. Slaughter Chancellor University of Maryland Room 1101, Main Administration Building College Park, Maryland 20742	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1986	
Barbara S. Uehling Chancellor University of Missouri 105 Jesse Hall Columbia, Missouri 65211	I-A At-Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1988*	
Richard L. Van Horn Chancellor University of Houston 4800 Calhoun, 212 E. Houston, Texas 77004	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1986	
Walter B. Waetjen President Cleveland State University 1983 East 24th Street Cleveland, Ohio 44115	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1986	
Walter Washington President Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-AA At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*	

Division II

Name, Institution	Term Expires	
Thomas A. Bond President Clarion University Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1)	Jan. 1986	
James W. Cleary President California State University Northridge, California 91330 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*	
Charles C. Hargrove President University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado 80309 (Region 4)		
Patsy Sampson President Stephens College Columbia, Missouri 65215 (Region 3)		Jan. 1988*
Barbara J. Seelye President Keene State College 229 Main Street Keene, New Hampshire 03431 (Region 1)		Jan. 1987*
Del D. Weber Chancellor University of Nebraska Omaha, Nebraska 68182 (Region 4)		Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
James T. Amsler President Salem State College 352 Lafayette Street Salem, Massachusetts 01970 (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Rev. William J. Byron President Catholic University Washington, D.C. 20064 (Region 1)	Jan. 1986
George Drake President Grinnell College P.O. Box 805 Grinnell, Iowa 50112 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Nenah E. Fry President Sweet Briar College Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595 (Region 3)	Jan. 1986
Richard C. Gilman President Occidental College Los Angeles, California 90041 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
Paul Hardin President Drew University Madison, New Jersey 07940 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
William A. Kinnison President Wittenberg University P.O. Box 720 Springfield, Ohio 45501 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Dennis O'Brien President University of Rochester 240 Administration Building Wilson Boulevard Rochester, New York 14627 (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Kenneth J. Weller President Central College Pella, Iowa 50219 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
James J. Whalen President Ithaca College Ithaca, New York 14850 (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
Cordell Wynn President Stillman College P.O. Drawer 1430 Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Administration

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*

Ruth M. Berkey, *Assistant Executive Director*
Louis J. Spry, *Controller*

Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Finance*
Frank E. Marshall, *Director of Accounting*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*

William C. Foreman, *Building Superintendent*
Cheryl L. Levick, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Roberta A. Rogers, *System Operator*
Lydia Sanchez, *Administrative Assistant*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*

Championships

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Patricia E. Bork, *Director of Women's Championships*
Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Men's Championships*

Tamatha G. Byler, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Daniel B. DiEdwardo, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Championships*
James A. Sheldon, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Cynthia L. Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Patricia W. Wall, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director*

James A. Marchiony, *Director of Media Services*
John T. Waters, *Director of Promotion*

James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*
Alfred B. White, *Assistant Director of Communications*
James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*

Cathy K. Bennett, *Production Coordinator*
Steve Boda Jr., *Associate Director of Statistics*
Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*

Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance and Enforcement

Stephen R. Morgan, *Assistant Executive Director*

S. David Berst, *Director of Enforcement*
John H. Leavens, *Director of Compliance*

Michael S. Glazier, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*
R. Dale Smith, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*
Charles E. Smrt, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

R. Daniel Beebe, *Enforcement Representative*
Melissa L. Conboy, *Enforcement Representative*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Enforcement Representative*
Janet M. Justus, *Enforcement Representative*
Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*
David V. Thompson, *Enforcement Representative*
James G. Worley, *Enforcement Representative*

Legislative Services

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director*
Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*
L. Douglas Johnson, *Director of Legislative Services*

Thomas P. Calder, *Legislative Assistant*
E. Jamie McCloskey, *Legislative Assistant*
Janice B. Wenger, *Legislative Assistant*
Shirley Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*

Publishing

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*
Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*
Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
Michael V. Earle, *Assistant Director of Publishing*
Timothy J. Lilley, *Managing Editor, the NCAA News*
Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
Lacy Lee Baker, *Publications Editor*
Victor M. Royal, *Publications Production Coordinator*

80th ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District 1

American International College: Robert E. Burke, Milton J. Pieupul
Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
Assumption College: Francis P. Gurley, Andrew Laska
Babson College: Steve Stirling
Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, Very Rev. J. Donald Monan
Boston University: Richard G. Fecteau, Averill C. Haines, Charles F. Taylor
Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
Brandeis University: Charles L. Crawford, Donna Devlin
Bridgeport, University of: Joseph E. Nechasek, Francis W. Poisson
Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): Mary Lou Thimas
Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan Taylor
Bryant College: William T. O'Hara
Central Connecticut State University: Henry S. Enck, Lowell D. Lukas, Richard A. McDuffie
Clark University (Massachusetts): Walter P. Halas
Colby College: Richard J. McGee
Connecticut, University of: John T. Casteen III, Patricia H. Meiser, John L. Toner
Curry College: Thomas G. Stephens
Dartmouth College: Edward Leland, Louise O'Neal, Edward Shanahan
Eastern Connecticut State University: William P. Holowaty
Emmanuel College: Regina Odom
Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook, Tamma O'Mara, William P. Schimpf
Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczak
Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
Hartford, University of: Robert A. Chernak, Michael Gargano, Gordon F. McCullough, Lee Yosha
Harvard University: Patricia H. Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.
Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
Lowell, University of: James Ciszek, Denise Legault
Maine, University of, Orono: Thomas Aceto, Lisa M. Burger, Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola
Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Jim Braun, Daniel Ghormley, Aloysius Rufe, Elaine Sortino, Harold J. VanderZwaag
Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary B. Barrett, Robert A. Corrigan, Charles Titus
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin Jr.

Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Joseph P. Ryan
Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr.
Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
Mount Holyoke College: Sharon L. Crow, Penny Curtis
New England College: George R. Hamilton
New Hampshire, University of: C. Robert Keesey, Andrew T. Mooradian, Michael O'Neil
New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
Nichols College: Karen J. Tropp
North Adams State College: Catherine A. Tisinger, Joseph Zavattaro
Northeastern University: Kris Burns, Irwin Cohen, John A. Freeman, Robert P. Lyons, Jeanne Rowlands
Norwich University: Joseph G. Sobol
Pine Manor College: Gail Parks
Plymouth State College: John P. Clark, Eugene Fahey
Providence College: Helen Bert, John F. Cunningham, Louis A. Lamoriello
Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith Burling
Rhode Island, University of: John R. Chuckran, Eleanor R. Lemaire, Robert C. Manteiga, A. Robert Rainville
Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
Roger Williams College: William H. Rizzini
St. Anselm College: Brother Joachim W. Froehlich, Theodore S. Paulauskas
St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
Salem State College: James T. Amsler, John D. Galaris
Simmons College: Sheila Brown
Smith College: Linda S. Moulton
Southeastern Massachusetts University: John R. Brazil, Robert Dowd
Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald
Springfield College: Frank S. Falcone, Edward S. Steitz
Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton
Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Capt. James A. Foels
Vermont, University of: Richard A. Farnham, Ben R. Forsyth, Denis E. Lambert
Wellesley College: Virginia L. Evans
Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad, Francis E. Nestor
Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
Western Connecticut State University: Paul Pasqualoni
Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Andronike Janus
Williams College: Robert R. Peck
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Susan E. Chapman, James P. Culpepper Jr.
Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
Yale University: Barbara Chesler, Robert E. Lehr, Frank B. Ryan

District 2

Adelphi University: Paul J. Doherty

Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Barbara J. Palm,
Patricia A. Rogers
Alfred University: Eugene Castroville
Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom
American University: Robert H. Frailey
Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
Binghamton, State University of New York: Steve Erber, Jessie A. Godfrey,
Nell C. Jackson
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Harry Ausprich, Joanne E. McComb,
John Mulka, Roger B. Sanders
Brooklyn College: Joseph A. Margolis, Molly Perdue
Bryn Mawr College: Jenepher P. Shillingford
Bucknell University: Bruce A. Corrie, Rosalyn K. Ewan, Robert A. Latour
Buffalo State University College: Fred J. Hartrick, Howard B. MacAdam
Buffalo, State University of New York: Norman Baker, Elizabeth Dimmick,
Edwin D. Muto
California University of Pennsylvania: Janice L. McConnell, John Pierce
Watkins
Canisius College: Lillian Levey, Daniel P. Starr
Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner, Joan E. Maser
Catholic University: Jone Dowd, Fred O'Connor
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson, Clarence Thomas
Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Frank Lignelli, Thomas J. Matczynski,
Frances M. Shope
Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston, Janet Little, V.
Martin Scarano
Columbia University-Barnard College: Alvin R. Paul, Marjorie N. Tversky
Cornell University: Betsy East, William D. Gurowitz, Harold G. Hall III,
Laing E. Kennedy, Terry Mallett
Cortland State University College: F. Wayne Blann, James M. Clark
Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Scotty Duncan, Mary Ann
Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson, David M. Nelson
Delaware State College: Luna I. Mishoe, Nelson E. Townsend
District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Claude A. Ford
Drew University: Maureen T. Horan, Richard E. Szlasa
Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
Duquesne University: Dennis Golden, Eileen B. Livingston
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Dennis D. Bell, Robert G.
Sutton, Clyde H. Witman
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Kathleen Lipkovich, James K. McDonald
Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
Elmira College: Leonard Simons, Patricia A. Thompson
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields, Irving Weiner
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Barbara I. Leshinsky, Irving Weiner
Fordham University: Francis X. McLaughlin
Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
Fredonia State University College: Elizabeth Darling

Gannon University: Howard Elwell
Geneseo State University College: Robert F. Riedel
George Mason University: Jack E. Kvancz
George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Lynn George
Georgetown University: Jesse A. Mann, Nathalie Paramskas, Francis X.
Rienzo
Gettysburg College: Robert T. Hulton
Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Pearl Kowalski
Hampton University: Ollie Bowman, Walter L. Lovett, P. LaVerne Sweat
Hartwick College: Thomas H. Greene
Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein
Herbert H. Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Mary E. Hosking
Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, Robert M. Getchell, Cindy Lewis
Howard University: Leo F. Miles, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
Hunter College: Charles Brown
Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, David A. DeCoster, Ruth
Podbielski, Herman L. Sledzik
Iona College: Michael T. Christy, Richard Mazzuto
Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, James J. Whalen
Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Wallace M. Pina
Kean College: Hawley C. Waterman
King's College: John J. Dorish
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Irv Hess, Carol Teske
La Salle University: William D. Bradshaw, Raymond Heath, Kathleen M.
Wear
Lafayette College: David W. Ellis, Olav B. Kollevoll
Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Richard P. Gibney, Peter Likins
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Charles A. Eberle, Sharon E. Taylor,
Craig Dean Willis, Bruce Young
Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: Ann Gulino
Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Patricia Lamb-Kennedy, Wayne
Sunderland
Loyola College (Maryland): Anne McCloskey, Thomas J. O'Connor, Rev.
Joseph A. Sellinger
Manhattan College: John J. Powers
Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Bernard S. Sabol
Marist College: Brian Colleary, Howard Goldman
Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Rick R. Hartzell, James C. Mohr,
Gary Rupert
Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Kirkland J. Hall
Marywood College: Jane Farr
Medgar Evers College: Paul Bobb
Mercyhurst College: Leonard J. Cyterski
Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker
Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Gary Reighard,

Marjorie A. Trout
Molloy College: Denise Cohen
Monmouth College (New Jersey): James Colclough, Samuel H. Magill
Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
Morgan State University: Raymond A. Downs, Frank S. Turner
Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
New Jersey Institute of Technology: Paul C. Hausser
New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
New York, City College of: Robert M. Behrman
New York Polytechnic Institute of: Joseph G. Martini
New York Institute of Technology: William T. Lai
New York Maritime College, State University of: James Migli
New York University: Daniel E. Quilty
Niagara University: Rev. Michael J. Shea
Oneonta State University College: Joseph R. Nicolette
Oswego State University College: John L. Spring
Pace University: Peter X. Finnerty, Susan K. Wirth, Edward Zanato
Pennsylvania, University of: Curtis Blake, Paul R. Rubincam Jr., Carolyn J. Schlie
Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Della Durant, Steve A. Garban, James I. Tarman
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
Pittsburgh, University of: Dean Billick, John W. Blanton, John O. Bolvin, Walter P. Cummins, Jack E. Freeman
Plattsburgh State University College: Joanna Davenport, Peter Luguri
Potsdam State University College: Conrad A. Bautz
Princeton University: Samuel C. Howell, Robert J. Myslik
Queens College: Brian DeMasters
Ramapo College: Kenneth McBryde
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
Rider College: Viola Udy
Robert Morris College: C. Robert Miller, Robert W. Norberg
Rochester, University of: John A. Reeves, Joyce S. Wong
Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti
Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Malcolm G. McLaren, Nancy K. Mitchell
Rutgers University, Newark, John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski, Gene A. Vincenti
St. Bonaventure University: Rev. Matthias Doyle, Lawrence J. Weise
St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Thomas Iannacone
St. John's University (New York): John W. Kaiser, Kathleen Meehan
St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Michael L. Schultz
St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
Salisbury State College: Louis Marciani
Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
Seton Hall University: Sue Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr.

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, James G. Pribula
Siena College: William J. Kirsch, Terry J. Reynolds
Skidmore College: Tim Brown
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robert N. Aebersold, Bruce G. Bolivar, William C. Lennox, Billy W. Walker
Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
Stockton State College: George L. James
Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra Weeden
Susquehanna University: Connie Delbungh, Donald Harnum
Swarthmore College: Troy Engle, Eleanor K. Hess, David B. Smoyer
Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Chet Gladchuk, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay
Temple University: Eve Atkinson, Michael J. Fetchko, Milton E. Richards, Robert E. Salomon, Charles Theokas
Thiel College: John A. Dickason
Towson State University: Bill Hunter, Nance Reed, Hoke L. Smith
Trenton State College: Roy W. Van Ness
U.S. Military Academy: Teresa M. Doyle, Brig. Gen. Roy K. Flint, Lt. Gen. Willard W. Scott Jr., Carl F. Ullrich
U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. John O. Coppedge
Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala
Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd
Utica College: Lansing G. Baker, James A. Spartano
Vassar College: Richard G. Becker
Villanova University: Mary Anne Steenrod
Wagner College: Walt Hameline
West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan Lubking, Richard B. Yoder
West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Diane L. Reinhard, Fred Schaus
Widener University: Bruce Bryde, William B. Manlove Jr.
Wilkes College: Philip Wingert
William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant
York College of the City University of New York: Stuart Bailin
York College (Pennsylvania): Jeff Gamber

District 3

Alabama, University of, Birmingham: Gerald T. Bird, John D. Jones, Richard L. Miller, J. Dudley Pewitt, Barbara Walker
Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Sam D. Bailey, Jimmy Carroll, Sarah Patterson, Ray Perkins, Richard Thigpen, Joab L. Thomas, Gary White
Alabama A&M University: Gene Bright
Alabama State University: Leon Howard, Hoyt E. Taylor
Albany State College (Georgia): Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
Appalachian State University: Thomas Bohannon, Judy Clarke, Jim Garner, John E. Thomas
Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer, Robert A. Burnett
Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, L. Oval Jaynes, James E. Martin

Augusta College: George A. Christenberry, Roscoe R. Williams
Austin Peay State University: Bob Brooks
Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen
Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
Barry University: B. Boyd Benjamin, Eddie A. Coletti
Bellarmine College: David O'Toole, James R. Spalding
Benedict College: Mary L. Davis
Berea College: Joan Weston
Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson
Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M. Kinder
Campbell University: Wendell L. Carr, Donald E. Phelps
Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Art W. Zeleznik
Centre College: Charles Vahlkamp
Christopher Newport College: R. Bev. Vaughan
Citadel, The: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Col. William L. Harris, Walt Nadzak
Clark College (Georgia): Edward McLean
Clemson University: S. Leonard Gough, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson, B. J. Skelton
Columbus College: Derek Mann, Robert D. Peterson
Davidson College: Christopher B. Morris, J. B. Stroud
Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Bradford W. Hovious, Kent Wyatt
Duke University: William D. Bradford M.D., Tom Butters, E. J. McDonald, A. Kenneth Pye, Lorraine Woodyard
East Carolina University: John M. Howell, O. Kenneth Karr, Ernest W. Schwarz
East Tennessee State University: Ronald E. Beller, George F. Sasser, Janice C. Shelton, Dan Summy
Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs, Martha Mullins
Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell
Emory University: Gerald B. Lowrey
Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns, Charles A. Lyons Jr., John D. Marshall Jr.
Fisk University: John C. Martin
Florida, University of: William C. Carr, Marshall M. Criser, Jeremy N. Foley, Richard C. Giannini, Mandell Glicksburg, Ann Marie Lawler, Keith Tribble, James C. Weaver
Florida A&M University: Sterling Adams, Theodore Hemmingway, Sarah E. Hill, Frederick S. Humphries
Florida Atlantic University: Thomas F. Baxley, Jack G. Mehl, Kenneth M. Michels, Gene Moore, Helen Popovich
Florida International University: Larry Baldwin, Emily H. Harsh, David Rice
Florida Southern College: Harold Smeltzly, Lois Webb
Florida State University: Charles Ehrhardt, Bob Goin, Cecil W. Ingram, Bernard F. Sliger
Fort Valley State College: Curtis E. Martin, Marion T. Porter
Frostburg State College: Harold J. Cordts
Furman University: Francis W. Bonner
Georgia, University of: Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Elizabeth Murphrey,

William M. Powell, John W. Shafer
Georiga Institute of Technology: Bernadette V. McGlade, James Murphy, Joseph M. Pettit, Homer C. Rice, William M. Sangster
Georgia Southern College: William H. Bolen, Dale W. Lick, Hank Schomber, David B. Wagner
Georgia State University: Noah N. Langdale Jr., G. Rankin Cooter, William S. Patrick
Greensboro College: Milton E. Reece
Hollins College: Marjorie Berkley, Lynda J. Calkins
Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Theron E. Montgomery
Jacksonville University: Paul S. Griffin, Jesse S. Robertson Jr.
James Madison University: Ben L. Carnevale, Ronald E. Carrier, S. Dean Ehlers, Leotus Morrison, Eileen S. Nelson, William R. Nelson
Johns Hopkins University: Sally Beth Anderson, Lucien Brush Jr., Robert H. Scott
Johnson C. Smith University: Horace T. Small
Kentucky, University of: Susan B. Feamster, Clifford O. Hagan, Robert G. Lawson
Kentucky State University: Raymond M. Burse
Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum
Lane College: Willie G. Shaw
LeMoyne-Owen College: Jerry C. Johnson
Liberty University: Chuck Burch, A. Pierre Guillermin, Allan F. Worthington
Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate, Roy Underwood
Longwood College: Carolyn V. Hodges
Louisiana State University: Robert E. Brodhead, John M. Drew, Bill McClure, Billy M. Seay, James H. Wharton, Joe R. Yates
Louisville, University of: Edward H. Hammond, Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen, Donald C. Swain
Lynchburg College: William H. Shellenberger
Marshall University: David T. Braine, Dorothy E. Hicks
Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselmann
Maryland, University of, College Park: Richard M. Dull, Ray Gillian, Randall G. Hoffman, John B. Slaughter, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler
Memphis State University: Weston Terry Brooks, Charles Cavagnaro, Lynn Parkes, Leroy Sutherland Jr.
Mercer University: William C. Bibb, Dan R. Quisenberry
Meredith College: Jay Massey
Miami, University of (Florida): Paul T. Dee, Edward T. Foote II, Sam Jankovich, Harry C. Mallios, Kathy Noble
Middle Tennessee State University: Jimmy Earle
Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Thomas C. Meredith, Jeanne Taylor, Max W. Williams
Mississippi College: John W. Legg, John M. Williams
Mississippi State University: Charles L. Carr, Donovan D. Horn, Denton Rogers, Donald W. Zacharias
Mississippi University for Women: Dorothy Burdeshaw, Joan T. Thomas
Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr., Herb F. Reinhard
Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson

Murray State University: David Perrin
New Orleans, University of: Cooper R. Mackin, Ronald J. Maestri, Jesse O. Snowden
Nicholls State University: Donald Ayo, Robert Falgout, Don Landry
Norfolk State University: Willard Bailey, Iris G. Brown, William Price
North Alabama, University of: Robert M. Guillot, Roy S. Stevens
North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Helen Carroll, Edward G. Farrell
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Christopher Fordham, William Friday, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, Arthur Padilla, Samuel H. Poole, John D. Swofford
North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Doug Orr, Thomas C. Turner, Judy Wilkins
North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Fred L. Drake, David B. Knight
North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks, Charles L. Cahill, David K. Miller
North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr., James A. Williams
North Carolina Central University: Carey Hughley, Sandra T. Shuler, Leroy T. Walker
North Carolina State University: Nora Lynn Finch, Clauston Jenkins, Richard D. Mochrie, Kevin O'Connell, Bruce R. Poulton, Frank Weedon
Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Gene W. Scholes
Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Melvin H. Williams
Pembroke State University: William H. Dean, Ray Pennington
Radford University: Valiant W. Mah, Chuck Taylor
Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Ladell Payne
Rhodes College: Chuck Gordon
Richmond, University of: Charles S. Boone, Albert C. Dawson, E. Bruce Heilman
Rollins College: Gordon E. Howell, Roy A. Kerr
Rust College: Ishmell H. Edwards
St. Andrews Presbyterian College: James M. Crabbe, A. P. Perkins Jr.
St. Augustine's College: George Williams
St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thomapson
St. Thomas University (Florida): Joseph T. Hoy, Paul Mainieri
Samford University: Paul F. Dietzel
Savannah State College: John H. Myles
South, University of: Mary Susan Cushman, Willard Huyck
South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, Jeral Williams
South Carolina, University of: Steven Beckham, James B. Holderman, Robert K. Marcum, William F. Putnam
South Carolina State College: Oscar P. Butler Jr., Willis C. Ham, M. Maceo Nance Jr.
South Florida, University of: Steward W. Schneller
Southeastern Louisiana University: J. Larry Crain, Leo P. Jones
Southern Mississippi, University of: Roland H. Dale, Sidney E. Weatherford
Southern University, New Orleans: Emmett W. Bashful, Artis M. Davenport

II
Stetson University: Pope A. Duncan, H. Douglas Lee
Sweet Briar College: Paul D. Cronin, Nenah E. Fry
Tampa, University of: Richard D. Cheshire, Fran Curci
Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Sharon Fanning, Thomas C. Ware, Harold B. Wilkes
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Donald Eastman, Andy Kozar, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Phil Scheurer, George R. Woodruff
Tennessee, University of, Martin: Nick Dunagan, Bettye Giles, William R. Kaler, Ray Mears
Tennessee State University: Johnny Carey, Julia M. Dinkins, Barbara C. Murrell, Roy P. Peterson
Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David W. Coffey
Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Robert E. Stewart
Tulane University: Mack Brown, Elizabeth B. Delery, Eamon Kelly, Charles B. Knapp, Wright Waters, Ron Watson
Valdosta State College: Hugh C. Bailey, James Goodman, Joe A. Gore
Vanderbilt University: George Bennett, Paul Harrawood, Roy Kramer, Joe B. Wyatt
Virginia, University of: Richard D. Schultz, Todd Turner, D. Alan Williams
Virginia Commonwealth University: Edmund F. Ackell, Steve Danish, Lewis B. Mills, Elizabeth S. Royster
Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, John G. Barrett, Eric Hyman, Gen. Sam S. Walker
Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Jo K. Kafer, William E. Lavery, Charlie Phlegar, James I. Robertson Jr., Clyde Walker
Virginia State University: James F. Battle
Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn, Gene E. Hooks, John W. Sawyer
Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
Washington College: Edward L. Athey
West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes
Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, Robert L. Waters
Western Kentucky University: William E. Bivin, Paul B. Cook, Pam Herriford, John D. Minton, Jim Richards
Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter, Carol A. Fritz
William and Mary, College of: John H. Randolph, George Storck, Paul R. Verkuil, Mildred B. West, Lawrence L. Wiseman
Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Steve Vacendak

District 4

Akron, University of: David H. Adams, Robert Fournier, Ted A. Mallo, William V. Muse, Mary Ann Tripodi
Albion College: Frank Joranko
Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell
Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone

Ball State University: Don Purvis, John Reno, Andrea Seger, George E. Swafford, John E. Worthen
Bemidji State University: Patricia A. Rosenbrock
Bowling Green State University: John C. Gregory, Marvin L. Kumler, Kevin McHugh, Paul J. Olscamp
Butler University: Mary Ann Rohleder, William L. Sylvester
Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, David B. Tuuk, Doris Zuidema
Capital University: Armin P. Langholz
Carleton College: Marjorie Mara, Mylla Urban
Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
Carthage College: August R. Schmidt
Central Michigan University: David B. Keilitz, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance
Chicago, University of: Mary Jean Mulvaney, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Greg Warzecka
Chicago State University: Barbara J. Farnandis, Bruce W. Herron
Cincinnati, University of: Carl R. Meyer, Thurman Owens, Gordon S. Skinner, Jean E. Tuerck
Cleveland State University: Susan A. MacManus, Walter B. Waetjen
Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho
Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks
Denison University: F. Trefor Gamble, Cheryl A. Marra, Marci McCaulay
DePaul University: James Doyle, Bob Grim, Edward J. Manetta Jr., Jean Ponsetto
DePauw University: Thomas A. Mont
Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman, Rev. Robert Mitchell
Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
Eastern Illinois University: R. C. Johnson, Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Joan K. Schmidt
Eastern Michigan University: Lucy Parker, Eugene Smith, William Turowski, Roy Wilbanks
Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott, Linda Wambach
Ferris State College: Thomas G. Cook, Tom Kirinovic, Robert J. Kosanovich
Grand Valley State College: Joan Board, Thomas E. Hendrix, Arend D. Lubbers, George M. MacDonald
Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist
Hope College: William R. Vanderbilt
Illinois, University of, Champaign, Alyce Cheska, Thomas E. Everhart, Karol Kahrs, John E. Koenig, John E. Nowak, Neale R. Stoner
Illinois, University of, Chicago: William Mays, Thomas Russo
Illinois Benedictine College: Anthony L. LaScala
Illinois State University: Robert E. Frederick, Linda Herman, Donna Taylor, Donna Jo Workman
Indiana Central University: Kenneth Borden, William A. Bright
Indiana University, Bloomington: Ralph N. Floyd, Isabella Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Haydn H. Murray, John W. Ryan
Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Donald J. Schmidt
Iowa, University of: Samuel L. Becker, Larry Bruner, Chalmers W. Elliott,

Sabrina Ford, Christine H. B. Grant, Linda Hackett, W. Fred Mims, Bonnie Slatton
John Carroll University: James M. Lavin, Kathleen Manning, Gerald J. Schweickert
Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Thomas J. Barber, Judy Devine, John Konstantinos, Michael Schwartz, William E. Shelton
Kenyon College: Jeffrey Vennell
Lake Forest College: Michael E. Dau
Lake Superior State College: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones
Lawrence University: Rich Agness
Lewis University: Paul Ruddy
Loyola University (Illinois): Loyal K. Park, Samuel P. Ramenofsky
Macalester College: Sheila Brewer
Marietta College: J. Phillip Roach
Marquette University: Carla H. Hay, Henry C. Raymonds
Miami University (Ohio): Harold W. Jasper, Paul G. Pearson, Richard G. Shrider, Karen Womack
Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Paul W. Gikas M.D., Donald Lund, Phyllis M. Ocker, Mike Palmisano, Will Perry, Clifford J. Sjogren, Don Triveline
Michigan State University: John A. DiBiaggio, Kathy Lindahl, Gwendolyn Norrell, Douglas W. Weaver
Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly
Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Linda Larson, Bruce McLeod, Dennis L. Nelson, Richard W. Ojakangas
Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Merrily Dean Baker, Holger Christiansen, Elayne M. Donahue, Paul R. Giel, Donna Olson, Robert A. Stein, Frank B. Wilderson Jr.
Mount Union College: Larry Kehres
North Central College: Russell J. Poel
North Park College: William A. Anderson
Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Jerry A. Ippoliti, Susie Pembroke-Jones, Nancy M. Vedral, Clyde J. Wingfield
Northern Michigan University: James B. Applebury, Barbara J. Patrick, R. Thomas Peters Jr., Jerry Saundri, John R. Taylor
Northwestern University: Anne S. Barbour, Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft, Cynthia M. Patterson, Doug Single
Notre Dame, University of: Eugene F. Corrigan, Rev. Edmund P. Joyce, Sharon Petro
Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson
Oberlin College: George Andrews, Mary J. Culhane, Susan Kane
Ohio Northern University: Janet R. Kittell, Herbert N. Strayer
Ohio State University: Phyllis Bailey, Richard M. Bay, Laura Blomquist, James L. Jones, C. J. Slanicka
Ohio University: John Gerdy, Robert Kline, Anne McClanahan, Harold N. McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt
Ohio Wesleyan University: John A. Martin
Olivet College: Susan Bujack

Otterbein College: C. Brent DeVore, Terri Hazucha, Elmer W. Yoest
Purdue University: George S. King Jr., Carol Mertler, Philip E. Nelson
Quincy College: Rev. James Toal
Rockford College: William F. Langston, Donald R. Thielen, Joel W. Tibbets
Saginaw Valley State College: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
St. Catherine, College of: L. J. Larson
St. John's University (Minnesota): John Gagliardi
St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Fred Berger
St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
St. Norbert College: Albert E. Negratti
St. Olaf College: Robert D. Gelle
St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg, Frank Mach
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Pamela C. Gunsten, Cynthia Jones, G. Lynn Lashbrook
Southern Indiana, University of: Donald Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
Toldeo, University of: Vernon M. Smith, Charles Snyder, John W. Stoepler, Marnie W. Swift
Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, William L. Steinbrecher
Wabash College: Lewis S. Salter
Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, Fred A. Mulhauser, Christ Petrouleas
Western Illinois University: Carl B. Hensley, Leslie F. Malpass, Gil Peterson, Helen Smiley, Ralph H. Waggoner
Western Michigan University: Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Diether H. Haenicke, Christine Hoyles, Leo C. Vander Beek
Wheaton College (Illinois): Jerry Chaplin, Tony Ladd, Jack Swartz
Winona State University: Toni Poll-Sorensen
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Donald F. Harden, Charles Ihrke, Edward W. Weidner
Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: Sharlen Peter, E. William Vickroy
Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Otto Breitenbach, Diane Lindstrom, Frank J. Remington, Kit Saunders
Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Daryl A. Leonard, Norma Rees
Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Edward Anderson, Helen H. Briwa, James J. Flood
Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Don Amiot, Nancy Page, Virgil Thiesfeld
Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus
Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Willie Myers
Wittenberg University: Linda L. Arena, William A. Kinnison, Virginia H. Lucas, Robert E. Rosencrans
Wooster, College of: Henry J. Copeland, Alvin J. Van Wie
Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Paige E. Mulholland, Gordon L. Wise, Peggy L. Wynkoop
Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Earl J. Kronenberger, Art Shriberg
Youngstown State University: Paul M. Dutton, Joseph F. Malmisur, Paul C. Peterson, Pauline N. Sateernow

District 5

Augustana College (South Dakota): Virgil C. Sandvig
Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
Buena Vista College: Darrell J. Peck
Central College (Iowa): Kenneth J. Weller
Central Missouri State University: Philip W. Conn, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes
Colorado, University of: Ted D. Ayers, William H. Baughn, Glendon Drake, Bill Marolt
Cornell College: Jerry Clark
Creighton University: Robert J. Gerraughty, Don Leahy
Drake University: James A. Adams, Michael Ferrari, Robert D. Karnes, Betty Miles
Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild, John A. Pfitsch
Indiana State University: Alpha Cleary, Bernard F. Cooper, John C. Jessell
Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Max Urick
Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Gary Hunter, Monte C. Johnson
Kansas State University: Lee Moon, Robert R. Snell, Larry Travis
Lincoln University (Missouri): Yvonne W. Hoard, Lucius Jones
Luther College: Betty A. Hoff, Reginald Laursen
Mankato State University: Georgene Brock, Don Buchanan, Joe Farnham, Margaret R. Preska, Mark Schuck
Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joe Castiglione, Dave Hart, Henry T. Lowe, Paul Miller
Missouri, University of, Rolla: Rodney A. Schaefer
Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Judith Berres, Charles P. Korr, Charles Smith, Fred Wilke
Morningside College: Erv Mondt
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, Martin Massengale, James O'Hanlon
Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Bobby Thompson, Larry Trussell, Del D. Weber
Nebraska Wesleyan University: Orson L. Christensen, Arthur C. Nicolai
North Dakota, University of: John Gasparini, George W. Schubert
North Dakota State University: David Forbes, Ade L. Sponberg
Northern Colorado, University of: Robert L. Heiny, Robert A. Oliver
Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, John Mermier, Dixon L. Riggs, Sandra Williamson
Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, John P. Mees, Sherri Reeves
Oklahoma, University of: Daniel G. Gibbons, Frank E. Horton, Wade H. Walker
Oklahoma State University: Lawrence L. Boger, Gerald M. Lage, Myron Roderick
Oral Roberts University: Larry Cochell, Cip Patterson
St. Cloud State University: Kenneth A. Ames, Morris Kurtz, Gladys Ziemer
St. Louis University: James Bakken, Albert E. Bender Sr.
South Dakota, University of: Jack Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock

South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson, Ruth Marske
Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Marvin Rosengarten
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, Jim Livengood,
Margaret Matthias, Albert Somit, Charlotte West
Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
Stephens College: Patsy H. Sampson
Tulsa, University of: Michael W. Davis, Barry A. Kinsey, Bradley E. Place, J. Paschal Twyman
Wartburg College: John F. Kurtt
Washington University (Missouri): Lynn C. Imergoot, Harry Kisker, John Schael
West Texas State University: Bruce A. Grimes, Ed D. Roach, Donald W. Wells
Wichita State University: Warren Armstrong, Lewis Perkins, Martin M. Perline, Michael D. Strickland

District 6

Abilene Christian University: Garvin V. Beauchamp
Alcorn State University: Marino H. Casem, Norris Allen Edney, Walter Washington
Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, Ollie S. Cauthen, Waynette Dolan, Phil George, Lloyd D. Vincent
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon, Albert N. Witte
Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Kevin Anglin, Richard Turner, Leslie Wyatt
Arkansas State University: Bill Davidson, Sam R. Gennuso, Larry Lacewell, Eugene W. Smith
Baylor University: David Guinn, Edwin P. Horner, Bill Menefee
Centenary College: Alvadus Bradley McPherson, Walter C. Stevens
East Texas State University: Charles J. Austin, Vincent J. Gonino, Margaret Harbison, Ernest Hawkins
Eastern New Mexico University: Paul Coggins, B. B. Lees, Robert L. Matheny
Grambling State University: Joseph B. Johnson, Eddie Milton Jones, Edward G. Robinson
Hardin-Simmons University: L. Ross Johnson
Houston, University of: Rudy Davalos, Thomas J. Ford, Michael T. Johnson, Lee McElroy, Mary Nyholm, Richard L. Van Horn
Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings
Howard Payne University: Hal Lane
Jackson State University: James A. Hefner, Walter Reed, William Rush
Lamar University: Alice C. Bell, Billy J. Franklin, Jim B. Higgins, Sonny Jolly, Larry W. Spradley
Louisiana Tech University: Pat Gerrett, F. Jay Taylor, Bob Vanatta
McNeese State University: Ted Brevelle, Jack V. Doland, Charley W. Sparks
Midwestern State University: Stephen A. Holland
Mississippi Valley State University: Joe L. Boyer, Reginal L. Henderson, Charles Prophet

North Texas State University: Irma Caton, Peter B. Lane, Fred N. McCain, John Thornton
Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard Dolecheck, Benny Hollis
Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Tynes Hildebrand, Joseph J. Orze
Pan American University: Ronald L. Applbaum, Conrad L. Colbert
Prairie View A&M University: Charles T. Edwards Jr., Brutus N. Jackson, Percy A. Pierre, Stefann Robinson
Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, August Erfurth, Martha Hawthorne, John R. May
Sam Houston State University: Matt Fenley, E. Rex Isham, Ron Randleman
Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, Robert L. Hitch, Lonnie D. Kleiver, John D. Twining
Southern University, Baton Rouge: Richard A. Hill, Joffre T. Whisenton
Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Robert L. Hardesty, Billy M. Miller
Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Louie Alford, Ray P. Authement, Sherry LeBas, Terry Don Phillips, Gerald L. St. Martin
Stephen F. Austin State University: Sadie Allison, Dianne Baker, Jim Hess, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
Texas, University of, Arlington: William E. Reeves
Texas, University of, Austin: Lin Adams, Leon Black, Ronald M. Brown, DeLoss Dodds, Francie Frederick, Beverly Hadaway, Craig Helwig, Donna A. Lopiano, L. O. Morgan, W. O. Shultz
Texas, University of, San Antonio: Daniel O. Hogenauer, Jim Skaines
Texas A&I University: Steven Altman, Pence Dacus
Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow
Texas Christian University: Tom F. Badgett, Carolyn Dixon, William H. Koehler, Mel Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank Windegger
Texas Southern University: John Rudley, T. Jones
Texas Tech University: Jeannine McHaney, Robert M. Sweazy
Texas Woman's University: Joanne Kuhn
Trinity University (Texas): Gene Norris

District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig, Louis A. Onofrio
Brigham Young University: Jeffrey R. Holland, Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace
Colorado College: Susan J. Bethanix, Richard Taber, Frederick C. Tinsley
Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
Colorado State University: G. James Francis, Thurman F. McGraw, Nancy J. O'Connor
Denver, University of: Anthony R. Cillo, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
Eastern Montana College: Elwood B. Hahn, Randy Howard
Gonzaga University: Dale E. Goodwin
Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Cynthia Mazda
Idaho, University of: William S. Belknap, Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin
Idaho State University: Italo J. Caccia, Darold H. Chambers, Kathy Hildreth
Metropolitan State College: William Helman

Montana, University of: W. Arthur Graham, Barbara B. Hollman, Harley W. Lewis
Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson, Ginny Hunt
Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard M. Trachok, William P. Wallace
New Mexico, University of: John D. Bridgers, Linda K. Estes, Leon E. Griffin
Northern Arizona University: Eugene M. Hughes, Greg Hughes, Tom Jurick, Sam F. McClanahan, Gary Walker
Regis College (Colorado): Christopher Dittman
San Diego State University: James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
Southern Utah State College: Steve Lunt, M. L. Smith
Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns
U.S. Air Force Academy: Ed Cliatt, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Harvey Schiller
Utah, University of: Karl Benson, W. James Copeland, Arnold C. Ferrin, Fern Gardner
Weber State College: Gary T. Crompton, Dean W. Hurst, Carol S. Westmoreland
Wyoming, University of: Mary Ellen Cloninger, Gary Cunningham, Joseph R. Geraud

District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Stephen Johnson, David L. Outcalt, Ronald J. Petro
Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Frank E. Buske, Edwin W. Lawrence, Karen J. Morris, Harris Shelton
Arizona, University of: Allan Beigel, Robert Bockrath, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey
Arizona State University: Jim Ferguson, Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Milton R. Schroeder
California, University of, Berkeley: Ira Michael Heyman, Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Mike Moss, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
California, University of, Davis: Samuel H. Logan, Gale E. Mikles
California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, Robert L. Halvaks, Kaia Hedlund, Stuart M. Krassner, Jack W. Peltason
California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, Michael Sondheimer, Charles E. Young
California, University of, Riverside: Chris Rinne, James J. Sims
California, University of, San Diego: Judith M. Sweet
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Edward E. Birch, Michael T. Bowers, Kenneth E. Droscher, Alice Henry
California Institute of Technology: Warren G. Emery
California Lutheran College: Robert Doering
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Marilyn McNeil, Kendrick W. Walker, Michael Wenzl
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Jack B. Frost, Karen L. Miller
California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Richard W. Graves, George Hibbard
California State University, Chico: Don Miller

California State University, Dominguez Hills: Susan A. Carberry Harold Charnofsky
California State University, Fresno: Allen Agnew, Jack Lengyel, Diane Milutinovich
California State University, Fullerton: Edward O. Carroll, Leanne Grotke, Barbara S. Stone
California State University, Hayward: Judith L. Hirsch, Alfred R. Mathews Jr., Ellis E. McCune
California State University, Long Beach: Kay Don, John V. Kasser, Keith Ian Polakoff
California State University, Los Angeles: Gary Hunt, Dennis J. Keihn, Mike Moode
California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, James W. Cleary, Robert J. Hiegert, James Sefton
California State University, Sacramento: Robert Taft Olmstead Jr.
California State University, San Bernardino: James D. Crum, Reginald L. Price
California State University, Stanislaus: Jim Hanny, Wayne Pierce
Chapman College: Walter Bowman
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: John Zinda
Eastern Washington University: Frank Nelson, Ron Raver, Mary Rubright
Humboldt State University: John Hennessy, Chuck Lindemann, Michael Wartell
Lewis and Clark College: Fred O. Wilson
Loyola Marymount University: Margaret P. Olaveson, Brian Quinn
Mills College: Robert G. Driscoll
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Christina L. Kunzer, Robert C. Maxson, Bradley L. Rothermel
New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Karen Fey, Al Gonzales, Del Wells
Occidental College: Lynn M. Pacala
Oregon, University of: William F. Bryant, Bill Byrne, Chris Voelz
Oregon State University: John R. Davis, Lynn Snyder
Pacific, University of the: Stanley E. McCaffrey, Carl R. Miller, Stanley Volbrecht
Pepperdine University: John Watson, Wayne Wright
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan, Curtis W. Tong, Robert T. Voelkel
Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
Portland State University: Roger N. Edgington, Robert W. Lockwood
Puget Sound, University of: Richard Ulrich
Redlands, University of: Ted C. Runner, Pam Walker
St. Mary's College (California): Donald J. McKillip, William D. McLeod
San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke, Patrick G. Cahill
San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill
San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow
San Jose State University: Lynn Eilefson, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
Santa Clara University: Mary Grace Colby, Daniel J. Curry, Robert M. Senkewicz

Seattle Pacific University: Wesley E. Lingren, Keith R. Phillips
Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey
Southern California, University of: John A. Barrett, Margaret Gatz, Barbara Hedges, Virgil G. Lubberden, Michael B. McGee
Stanford University: Jack H. Friedenthal, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Pamela Strathairn
U.S. International University: Al J. Palmiotto
Utah State University: E. Kaye Hart, Norman B. Jones, Rod Tueller
Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Milo R. Lude
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Harold Gibson, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith, Richard A. Young
Whitman College: Craig Gunsul
Whittier College: David A. Jacobs
Willamette University: Richard Kaiser

Conference Members

Association of Mid-Continent Universities: F. L. Ferzacca
Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James, John A. Fuzak, Jonathon B. LeCrone
Atlantic 10 Conference: Rob Bertovich
Big East Conference: David R. Gavitt, Linda M. Bruno
Big Eight Conference: Carl C. James, Prentice Gautt
Big Sky Conference: Ronald D. Stephenson
Big South Conference: Edward M. Singleton
Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Dewey, Phyllis Howlett, Clarence Underwood Jr.
California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
*Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman
College Athletic Conference: Walter D. Bryant
Colonial Athletic Association: Thomas E. Yeager
Continental Divide Conference: Christopher Dittman
East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, Clayton W. Chapman
*Eastern College Athletic Conference Metro: Frank Szymanski
Eastern States Athletic Conference: Louis Marciani
Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Tom Donahue
Gulf South Conference: Ralph McFillen
Gulf Star Conference: Dave Waples
*Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
High Country Athletic Conference: Margie McDonald
Ivy Group: Jeffrey H. Orleans
Lone Star Conference: Shirley Morton
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Don J. DiJulia, David Lehn
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Steven J. Hatchell, Craig

Thompson
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Albert L. Deal
Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: David B. Eavenson
Midwestern Collegiate Conference: James W. Shaffer, Kirk A. Hendrix
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
Missouri Valley Conference: James A. Haney, Joe Mitch
Mountain West Athletic Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg
*New England College Conference Wrestling Association: Donald M. Russell
New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Leete Jr.
New Jersey Athletic Conference: Lawrence R. Schiner
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Collins
North Star Conference: R. Elaine Dreidame
Northeast-Eight Conference: Elwood N. Shields
Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
Northern Pacific Athletic Conference: Beth J. Bricker
Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
Ohio Valley Conference: James E. Delaney
Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Lewis A. Cryer, Dennis A. Farrell
Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, David Price
*Pacific West Athletic Conference: Terri Riffe
Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, Robert M. Barrett, James McCullough, Suzanne Stogner, Mark Womack
Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Howard Davis, James E. Hawkins
Southland Conference: Dick Oliver, Margie Klar
Southwest Athletic Conference: Dutch Baughman, Dennis Robinson
Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, Gilbert E. Stampley
Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas, Doug Elgin
Trans America Athletic Conference: Lou McCullough
West Coast Athletic Conference: Michael M. Gilligan
Western Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Kearney, Dee Menzies
*Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola
Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird
*Nonvoting.

Affiliated Members

American Baseball Coaches Association: Lee Eilbracht, Ron Polk
American Football Coaches Association: Charles McClendon
College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas
Collegiate Volleyball Coaches Association: Sandra L. Vivas
Golf Coaches Association of America: Jim Brown, Doug Gordin, John MacDonald, Robert E. Nye
Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Stanley J. Clark
National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin
National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary,

Timothy W. Gleason

National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell

NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Dick Roberts

Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

Corresponding Members

Chaminade University: Mike Vasconcellos

North Florida, University of: Tom Healy

Peach Bowl, Inc.: Dick Bestwick

Southern Colorado, University of: Robert Mullen

Southwest Baptist University: Rex Brown

Visitors

Ala Moana Americana Hotel: Adele Samson

Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Paul H. Brand, Clyde Riley

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: William L. Wall

American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Richard Novak

American Council on Education: Sheldon E. Steinbach

American Institutes for Research: Steven M. Jung

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Cliff Sjogren

Basketball Hall of Fame: Joseph O'Brien

Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Joseph Auth, Theodore D. Dimauro, William C. Sullivan, Daniel M. Walsh

Bluebonnet Bowl: Jack Busiek, Larry Catuzzi, Ted Nance

Bronx Community College: Roscoe C. Brown Jr.

California Bowl: John Sirman, Glen R. Driscoll

Cherry Bowl: Frank "Muddy" Waters

Cotton Bowl: Jim Brock

Findlay College: James D. Houdeshell

Fort Lewis College: Chuck Walker

Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, John J. Cunningham, Bruce Kirsh, Walter Peterson

Gator Bowl Association: George R. Olsen

Heery-Fabrap: Bob Eskew

Heitzinger, Ron; Madison, Wisconsin

Hochberg, Philip R.; Washington, D.C.

Independence Bowl: Tracy Jackson

Licensing Company of America: Bob Bell

Loras College: Mike Budde, Jan Leiser, Kevin M. White

Meadowlands: Leslie H. Unger

Molton Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka

National Invitation Tournament: George R. Bisacca, Peter A. Carlesimo

Oahu Travel: Pam Goodman

Orange Bowl Committee: Stephen A. Lynch III, Jerry Romig, Tom Wicker

Paine College: Ronnie Spry

Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jim Boyle, Millard Davidson, Stan Hahn, Fred W. Soldweel, Art D. Welsh

Remediation and Training Institute: Marshall Banks

South Carolina, University of, Spartanburg: Gene DeFilippo

Sugar Bowl: Jim Higgins, Mickey Holmes

Tennessee Higher Education Commission: Arliss L. Roaden

Weistart, John C.; Durham, North Carolina

West Florida, University of: Joe Ellenburg

Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judy Kruckman

Working News Media

Alexandria Town Talk: Bill Tompkins

Ann Arbor News: Stephen Cain

Associated Press: Bill Haber, Herschel Nissenson, Doug Tucker, Austin Wilson

Atlanta Journal: Furman Bisher, David Davidson

Atlantic Advisor: Rich Esquinas, Greg Kirstein

Baltimore Evening Sun: Molly Dunham, John Eisenberg

Baton Rouge Morning Advocate: Donald E. Lewis, Dave Moorman

Baton Rouge State-Times: George Morris, Carl Redman

Birmingham News: Alf Van Hoose

Bradley Photography: Betty Bradley, James T. Bradley

CBS Radio: Dick Brescia

CBS Sports: Mark Carlson, Len DeLuca, Peter Lund, Neal Pilson, Peter Tortorici

Cable New Network: John Fricke

Cablesports: Dantia Quirk

Capital Cities, Inc.: Donn R. Bernstein

Charlotte Observer: Leonard Laye

Chicago, University of: Jim Foreman, Larry Hawkins

Chicago Tribune: Linda Kay

Chronicle of Higher Education: Charles Farrell, Peter Monaghan, John Phillips

Daily Oklahoman: Jerry McConnell

Dallas Morning News: Mark Blaudshun, Mitch Lawrence, Mark McDonald, Laura Miller

Dallas Times-Herald: Steve Schoenfeld

Durham Herald: Keith Drum

ESPN: Steve Bornstein, Loren Matthews, Dave Ogle, Mike Soltys

East Carolina University: John Howell

Evansville Sunday Courier & Press: Bob Sander

Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Kim Brewer, Whit Canning

Greensboro News & Record: Wilt Browning

Greenville News: Ron Green

Hartford Courant: Ken Davis

Higher Education Daily: Jennifer Jansen

Houston Chronicle: Eddie Sefko

Houston Post: John Klein

Huntsville Times: James R. Magness

Independence Bowl: Paul Manasseh

KEUN Radio: Gary Hilbert

KRLD Radio: Chuck Cooperstein

Kansas City Star-Times: Stephen Richardson

Knoxville News-Sentinel: Al Browning

Lexington Herald-Leader: Jeffrey Marx, Mike York
Lorimar Sports Network: Keith Samples
Los Angeles Times: Tracy Dodds, David Savage
MacNeil-Lehrer Report: Darcel Dillard
Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning
Minneapolis Star & Tribune: Jay Wiener
Monroe News-Star World: Bill Campbell
Mutual Broadcasting Company: Luke Griffin
NBC: Bob Elliot, Warren Ferguson, George Finkel, Holt Holypidel, Rick Hussey, Steve Marisi, Sean McManus, Ken Schanzer, Arthur Watson
NOE: Mary Foster
Nashville Banner: Joe Biddle, Fred Russell
New Orleans Times-Picayune: Blyen S. Bordeaux, Marty Mule, Helen Smith, Bill Walsh
New York Times: Michael Graslin, Gordon White
Newsday: Manny Topol
Orange County Register: Michele Himmelberg
Phi Delta Kappam: Jerome Cramer
Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
Raycom Sports Network: Ken Haines, Dee Ray, Rick Ray
Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
Roanoke Times-World-News: Bill Brill
Sacramento Bee: Bob Graswich
St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Dave Dorr
Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney
Satellite Program Network: Dave Kempton
Sports Illustrated: Doug Looney, Bob Sullivan
Sports News: Dave Nightingale
USA Today: Steve Weiberg
United Press International: David Moffitt, Mike Rabun
Voice of American: Matthew Bell
WDSU-TV: Ron Brown: Ray Tassim
WFIA-TV: John Sparks
WFDA-TV: Russ Bauman, Mike Capps
WJBO Radio: Stuart Heck, Bryan Rushing, Bill Wagy
WLAE-TV: Walter Bass
WRAL-TV: Rick Armstrong, Tim Kent
WTBS: Rohan Backfish, Teresa Busch, Skip Ellison, Michael Lardner, Rex Lardner Jr., John D. Vandegrift
WWF Radio: Ron Gasper, Taylor Henry
WYLD Radio: Keith Newton
Washington Post: Mark Asher
Fred Malszka
Steve Springer

80th ANNUAL CONVENTION OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Monday Morning, January 13, 1986

The 80th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, meeting at the Hilton Riverside and Towers Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 13-15, 1986, was called to order at 8 a.m., with President John R. Davis presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Davis: May I have your attention, please. We do need to start the Business Session promptly. Will the delegates please be seated. We will start the Business Session for this 1986 Convention. As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to the beginning of our business.

I now will ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with the work of the Convention.

Thomas Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I move we adopt the printed program.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Davis: Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, says the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures, and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your program, Pages xi through xv. Those also appear in the Official Notice of the Convention, and they were mailed to you more than seven weeks ago.

In addition, you will find in your program a reference listing of all the Association's legislation dealing with our Conventions. All of the NCAA Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite the work of the delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout. We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's Rules of Order.

Also, Robert's Rules of Order states that any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress the debate on any circularized proposal. There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. First, in all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask all the delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue.

If delegates intend to debate the issue, we ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at the microphones, the vote will

be called as quickly as possible.

On bylaw issues in the General Business Session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time. That is Division I first, Division II second and then Division III. The results of the division vote will not be announced until all the divisions have voted.

Each year in this session we review the voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions. Each active member-institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among themselves because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Member conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the Constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as active members. A member conference that does not have the vote—and any affiliated organization—may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that all individuals identify themselves and their affiliations clearly when they rise to speak. In fact, to assist the recorder, we ask that everyone identify themselves at the outset. Only those delegates wearing convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers. Delegates wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the staff in advance of the business session.

Ladies and gentlemen, many of these remarks by the chair each year are necessary for the record or to inform those who are attending their first NCAA Convention. I would now like to have your attention while I mention a few things that are unique and new at this year's Convention. This is a landmark Convention for the Association because today beginning in just a few minutes the various divisions and subdivisions will take final voting actions in their own business sessions for the first time. You will find the proposals to be acted upon in those sessions in Appendix A of your program. Because of that change in our procedures, a couple of adjustments have been made from that with which veteran delegates are familiar. For one thing, the deadline to submit any amendments to amendments, resolutions or the like, was yesterday at 1 p.m. That was necessary to assure that amendments are distributed at the beginning of your division and subdivision business sessions at 9 a.m. today. Those will be available when you go into those business sessions, and that change in deadline was announced more than seven weeks ago.

Because those amendments to amendments will include proposals to be voted upon in the General Business Session beginning Tuesday morning, please be sure that you keep the compilation of amendments to amendments with your convention booklet from day to day. You will need the same set of amendments Tuesday that you received the morning before going to your divisional sessions.

Finally, for all Division I delegates, let me announce that it appears that the Division I Business Session this afternoon will have its hands full just getting through the 15 voting actions, three of those by roll call. Therefore, we are asking that Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA Business Sessions this morning take time to discuss those 15 issues facing this afternoon's session, because there simply may not be time for discussion in the afternoon session.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Davis: It is now my privilege to identify for you the several

Convention Committees and the chair for each. The Nominating Committee is chaired by President Jack V. Doland of McNeese State University. The Men's Committee on Committees by Howard Elwell of Gannon University. The Women's Committee on Committees by Mary Roby, University of Arizona. The Voting Committee is chaired by Donald G. Combs, Eastern Kentucky University. The Committee on Memorial Resolutions by Darrell J. Peck, Buena Vista College.

The Committee on Credentials is chaired by Jane Goss of Shippensburg University. In accordance with our procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the printed Annual Reports, a copy of which was available for each member institution and conference when you registered.

The reports of the secretary-treasurer and that of the Executive Committee also appeared in the Annual Reports. Therefore, at the beginning of the General Business Session tomorrow morning, we will entertain motions to receive those reports. That gives us time to review those items in the Annual Reports before you are asked to approve them.

Now, we move to the report of the NCAA Council. It is my pleasure to introduce to you the vice-president and director of athletics at the University of Dayton, Tom Frericks. (Applause)

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Thomas J. Frericks (University of Dayton): Mr. President and members of the Association. It is an honor for me to summarize for you the NCAA Council's Report for 1985, a report that is mandated by the NCAA Constitution.

In compliance with that requirement, the official report of the Council consists of the abridged minutes of all Council meetings during the year, as they appear in the published Annual Reports of the Association. Each member institution and conference should have acquired a copy of the Annual Reports when their delegates registered for this Convention. The abridged Council minutes in that book represent the Council's detailed report of its actions during the past year. I submit to you that a review of the Annual Reports would be helpful to understand background with the decision-making process of the Association.

The Council takes other steps to inform the membership of all of its actions and deliberations. The major actions in each meeting are reported in The NCAA News in the issue immediately following each meeting. One week later, the News lists every action taken by the Council in that meeting. As a result, within about two weeks of each meeting, the membership is informed of everything the Council has done.

There is little doubt that the major development in Association affairs in the past year was the special Convention called by the Presidents Commission last June. You are all aware of the steps taken by that Convention to strengthen the Association's enforcement program, establish new compliance efforts and enhance the stated desire of our institutions' chief executive officers to assure the proper conduct of intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education.

From those actions, the national office is undertaking a new major program of compliance services, apart from the enforcement operation, to assist institutions in meeting their obligations as members of this Association. That program and the availability of new, more stringent penalties for those who

persist in violating the rules will, the Council believes, provide all of us with the best opportunity in history to deal meaningfully and effectively with the well-publicized programs of intercollegiate athletics.

Much of the credit for all of this must be accorded to the Presidents Commission. It was the Commission that surveyed chief executive officers regarding means of dealing with the problems and abuses in athletics. It was the Commission that called the special Convention and generated the highest level of presidential participation of any Convention in NCAA history. And it was that participation that carried all eight of the Commission's proposals at that Convention to adoption—all by more than 90 percent affirmative votes.

In presenting the 1984 Council Report a year ago, president Asa Green of Livingston University said the Commission had within its reach the influence and leadership to create a better world for college athletics. The June Convention was a major step toward that goal. The Council believes the Commission has had a pronounced impact in its first 18 months of operation, and much of that credit must go to its first elected officers: Commission chair John W. Ryan, Indiana University; and its three division chairs, Barbara J. Seelye of Keene State College, Ken Weller of Central College (Iowa), and Otis A. Singletary of Kentucky.

One of the major issues of this Convention again involves the Council and the Presidents Commission. This is the proposed modification of Bylaw 5-1-(j) that appears as Proposal No. 16 and will be voted upon by the Division I delegates this afternoon. There may not be unanimity of opinion on that legislation, but it is a credit to both the Council and the Commission—and for that matter to the Association's democratic procedures—that they were able to agree on the proposal before you.

It is fair to say that the majority of the Division I members of the Council and the Commission see the proposal as a fair and reasonable adjustment in Bylaw 5-1-(j). Whether or not it is what the majority of the Division I members want will be determined by the roll call vote this afternoon, and that is the proper procedure as to how it should be determined.

Among the other Council activities during the past year was our continuing attention to the increasing "federation" within the Association structure. As you know, the separate divisions will, for the first time, take final actions at this Convention in their own business sessions on those matters relating only to them. Funding of NCAA championships, multidivision classification and other "federation" issues were a part of our discussions and yours in 1985. In fact, the Presidents Commission has asked the Council to develop an extensive report on all aspects of the Association structure and its "federation," and the 1986 Council will do that in time for the Commission's April meeting.

Another issue during the year was the matter of equity between the sport of track and field and the other sports recognized by the Association. Because the Council believes there is considerable inequity in that relationship, you have before you at this Convention Proposal Nos. 37, 56 and 69. The essence of all the three is that it is unfair to other sports to continue permitting indoor and outdoor track to be considered as two separate sports, and some movement is needed to treat track and field in a similar manner to all of the other sports recognized by the NCAA.

Let me emphasize that all three of those proposals stand alone; none is mooted by any action on the others. No. 37, to eliminate the indoor track championships, is based on the fact that nearly one-third of all of the subsidies

the Association pays for all of its championships in 21 sports goes to one and the same group of athletes: the track athletes in cross country, indoor track and outdoor track. This amounts of an annual subsidy of more than \$1.5 million in NCAA expenditures, twice as much as the subsidy in any other sport. We believe, and the Executive Committee believes, this is not fair to the other sports.

Similarly, No. 56 recognizes inconsistency with the way other sports are treated. It would say that track is one sport, not two, for sports-sponsorship purposes, just as fall and spring baseball are considered one sport. Proposal No. 69 is based on the same arguments of equity and consistency among sports. It says track should be one sport for eligibility purposes since, in fact, it is the same sport.

Mr. President, there are other issues I probably should review for the delegates; but in the interest of time, I will conclude. Permit me to mention that the Council spends a great deal of its time each year on interpretations, membership actions, committee reports and actions of the NCAA Administrative Committee. All of the actions in those areas have been reported in the forum mentioned earlier.

This concludes my summary of the 1985 Council report. Tomorrow morning, at the beginning of the general business session, we will offer a motion to have the Convention accept and approve the full Council report. Thank you very much.

President Davis: Thank you, Tom. My thanks to you and all of our colleagues on the Council for their dedication and good work during this past year.

At this time we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I would like to ask all the delegates and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. Now, I will present to you Darrell Peck of Buena Vista College, chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Darrell J. Peck (Buena Vista College): Ladies and gentlemen, in keeping with the tradition of recognizing our deceased colleagues at the first general session of the NCAA Convention, I will read the memorial list of those men and women who have died during the past year. These people represent many years of dedicated service through higher education and intercollegiate athletics. They are:

Paul O. Blixler, Colgate University/University of Pennsylvania

Joan Blumenthal, University of Oklahoma

Leann G. Davidge, Miami University (Ohio)

Charles R. Davies, Duquesne University

Richard L. Delaney, Ohio State University

Francis C. Dittrich, Michigan State University

Carol A. Eckman, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

Herbert C. Eisele, John Carroll University

James W. Ellingwood, North Adams State College

Fred A. Enke, University of Arizona

Newman H. Ertell, Wayne State University (Michigan)

Tom (Red) Foley, St. Mary's College (California)/Notre Dame University

J. Stokeley Fulton, Hampden-Sydney College

Robert J. Geary, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Irving R. (Ike) Groce, Oklahoma State University
Warren B. Harris, Princeton University/Rutgers University/University of Pennsylvania
Howard N. Hartman, Colgate University
Edward M. (Ted) Haydon, University of Chicago
Alfred J. Heinen, Buffalo State University College
Jerome H. (Brud) Holland, Hampton University/Delaware State University
Marcelina Huerta Jr., Wichita State University/University of Iowa
Cecil Isbell, Purdue University
William M. Jennings, Baylor University/Texas Tech University
Ernest Johnson, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Bobby Kellogg, Tulane University/Wake Forest University/Texas Tech University/Mississippi State University
William F. Kern, Carnegie-Mellon University
Theodore O. Kleinhans, Syracuse University
Frank M. (Bruiser) Kinard, University of Mississippi
William W. Knight, University of New Hampshire
Harold C. Krogh, University of Kansas
Henry N. Lamar, Harvard University
Harry C. Lancaster, University of Kentucky
Hubert Murry Lewis, Duke University
Arthur C. (Dutch) Lonborg, University of Kansas/Northwestern University
Andy MacDonald, University of Iowa/Northern Arizona University/University of Tulsa
George P. (Pat) Malley, Santa Clara University
Arthur W. Mansfield, University of Wisconsin, Madison
David S. McAlister, The Citadel
Leroy McClendon, Vanderbilt University/University of Texas, Austin/
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
Jack Medica, University of Pennsylvania
Karl B. Michael, Dartmouth College
Americo J. (Marty) Mortorelli, University of Wisconsin, Superior
Patrick S. Moynihan, Iowa State University
Malcolm E. Musser, Bucknell University
Dean D. Nesmith, University of Kansas
Norvall Neve, Missouri Valley Conference/Atlantic Coast Conference
Robert W. Nulf, Kalamazoo College
James N. Patton, New Mexico State University
Malcolm U. Pitt, University of Richmond
Mona Plummer, Arizona State University
Earl J. Porche, Tulane University
Ronald A. Renko, Iowa State University
Cornelius Righter, University of the Pacific
Frank Sanctet, University of Arizona
Phil Sarboe, Washington State University/Humboldt State University/
University of Hawaii
Frank A. Sevigne, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Alexander G. Severance, Villanova University
Edward R. Slaughter, University of Virginia
Joseph M. Stampf, University of Chicago
James H. Steward, Southern Methodist University/Southwest Athletic

Conference
Alonzo P. Stiner, Oregon State University
Robert L. Strehle, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges
John M. Summa Sr., Baldwin-Wallace College
Floyd M. Theard Jr., University of Denver
Bennie Thomas, Southern University, Baton Rouge
Waldo S. Tippin, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Brooks E. Wallace, Texas Tech University
Adam Walsh, Bowdoin College
Ralph O. Ward, McNeese State University
Ralph Weiland, Harvard University
Vernon S. Wilshere, Indiana University, Bloomington
Eric C. Wilson, University of Iowa
David A. Winter, Syracuse University
Lloyd C. Winter, San Jose State University
Francis M. Wistert, University of Michigan
Joseph Wood, Yale University
Waldo W. Yarnall, University of Lowell

May we now have a moment of silence of honor of these men and women.
Thank you.

President Davis: Thank you, Darrell. We are now recessed. Business sessions of all of the divisions will start at 9:00 this morning. Thank you all.

DIVISION I-A BUSINESS SESSION

January 13, 1986

The Division I-A Business Session was called to order at 9:15 a.m. by chairman Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University.

Mr. Bailey: Ladies and gentlemen, the Division I-A Business Session will please come to order. As has been mentioned this morning already, this is certainly a landmark Convention in that we are convened now at the first of the subdivision business sessions. I think it is correct to say that no component of the NCAA has been more concerned and more interested in promoting this aspect of federation than the Division I-A. We have the opportunity to take advantage of that for the first time this morning in planning for future business activities of the Association and this division.

We need very much, as President Davis indicated earlier, to take advantage of the opportunity for detailed discussion in this session of those items that will be acted on this afternoon so that we can compress as much as possible the time required for discussion before the actual voting this afternoon. First, though, we will vote on these five items. Then we will proceed to discuss the 15 proposals that are listed there on the agenda for the Division I Business Session this afternoon.

Please remember that in this voting session as in the general session and in the session for Division I this afternoon, voting is by use of paddle only. You will need your paddle for the vote in this session and throughout the remainder of the Convention. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle. We will now consider and act on the five amendments offered for vote in this session.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting Contacts

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to point out briefly that the purpose of this change is to prevent an institution from going into a school five days per week under the pretense of visiting different student-athletes each day but with the intent of seeing the same student-athlete. This does increase the legal contact at the school, but it is a more enforceable rule and it actually allows less traffic in the high schools while recruiting. I now move the adoption of Proposal No. 43—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment only eliminates three words—"for this purpose." This eliminates the loophole of a coach going into the school for purposes of the contact. So this amendment allows the coach to only go there one day a week for any purpose.

[Proposal No. 43—1 (page A-32) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-32) was approved as amended by No. 43—1.]

Division I-A Criteria

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of

Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am sure most of us in the room are well aware that we considered this amendment at the last Convention and with the expert leadership of our parliamentarian did not vote quite as we thought we had voted in that meeting. Let me say from the outset that this proposal is a permissive piece of legislation and in no way limits the athletics program of any university in this room. However, it does recognize the diversity of those institutions that are represented. In this day of the continuing rise of the cost of maintaining an intercollegiate athletics program, which every athletics director in this room can attest to, it behooves this Convention to seriously consider any proposal that addresses the limitation of the proliferation of those costs.

I read with considerable interest almost daily accounts of universities in this room from all sections of the country that either are eliminating sports or seriously considering that move. I note that many of these are very large state institutions, including members of the Big Ten Conference and the Pacific-10 Conference and the other major conferences. I would like to point out that these pressures are even greater on those of us who represent the private universities where an individual scholarship often costs in the neighborhood of \$12,000 to \$15,000. I also would like to point out that this requirement of six and six already applies to all members of Division I with the exception of Division I-A. In that light, we also should note that the only thing that defines the Division I-A is the sponsorship of football in this division. The requirement for that sponsorship is clearly defined by schedule, stadium size, attendance and numbers of scholarships. Therefore, this legislation cannot cause the proliferation of this division, nor can it be used as an argument to limit the number of schools in Division I basketball tournaments since those institutions already have the 12-sport requirement.

In recent years, we have increased the sports sponsorship from no requirement to the proposed 16 sports two years down the road. This impact is extremely serious for all of us who must raise funds, seek student fees, attempt to fill our stadiums with tickets that are priced at a level where we may begin to lose some of our most loyal fans in the street and the continued drop of television revenue. From all I can surmise from the people in the market, I see no potential for television to bring us "manna from heaven" in the foreseeable future.

I also am well aware that no one in this room will drop out of Division I because this legislation does not pass; because each of us in our own very creative way will sponsor the necessary sports on a token basis and thus provide a very poor competitive experience for the individual athletes who are involved, an experience which would be much better served in the club-sports setting.

Let us be honest for once and provide an opportunity for all of us in this room to sponsor the number of sports in which we can strive for excellence and thus provide a meaningful experience for the young men and women who were involved in the sport. Those pressures may well increase as other pieces of legislation are considered to include the dropping of indoor sports, indoor track as a countable sport and the requirement to sponsor two team sports in each of these areas.

I am aware of the argument that we should sponsor a well-rounded program. However, I would point out that the definition of a well-rounded

program should have some flexibility. Certainly, the sponsorship of 12 sports cannot be concluded to be a narrow approach to this commitment.

Furthermore, I would point out that an institution such as Vanderbilt, with some 400 students competing in 12 sports, is offering a competitive experience on a ratio of 1 to 14. At an institution with enrollment of 20,000 students, to reach that same ratio would require a competitive experience for some 1,300 or 1,400 athletes in the program on that campus. I believe those of us in institutions with more limited enrollment are certainly meeting our responsibility to provide competitive experiences for our students well within the scope provided by many of the huge state universities.

Finally, I believe the strength of the NCAA, and in particular the great football traditions that are represented in this room, is based on the long history of great contests that have always involved institutions with different plateaus of financial background, institutions privately financed, institutions with general state legislatures and institutions coming from states with limited resources. Yet those contests have built the tradition of intercollegiate football in this country. I simply ask you to consider all of these areas of concern and vote for Proposal No. 59.

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chairman, I wish to, as a president of an independent institution such as the University of the Pacific, support Proposal No. 59. The university president, particularly those of independent institutions, is extremely conscious these days of costs in all aspects of our total university program, certainly including intercollegiate athletics. At most independent institutions, intercollegiate athletics represents a loss, a deficit each year. To require all institutions to add four sports, two in men's and two in women's, to remain in Division I-A is simply increasing the costs of intercollegiate athletics, something that is extremely difficult for the president of an independent institution to justify to faculty, to a governing board and to all of our constituencies.

To add four additional sports, two in men's and two in women's, would cost perhaps another \$100,000, perhaps even more than that; because one grant-in-aid represents a cost of \$12,500 or more. When you add several grants-in-aid, coaches' salaries, other expenses entailed in each additional sport, it represents a great amount of money.

It certainly is splendid if institutions can have eight or more sports for men and for women. I congratulate them and commend them, and I am happy for them. But to require all of us, regardless of our financial position, to do so, I think, is unfair and unjustified.

Therefore, I hope you will vote in support of Proposal No. 59.

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): I would like to ask you to vote against this proposal. As one of those schools that proposed an increase in sports limitations, we really did that in requiring a broad-base program so that there can be opportunities for many students who do not participate in the revenue-producing sport.

We have been particularly concerned since the merger of both men's and women's sports to the NCAA that for a variety of reasons, quite a number of schools worry about the budget. Many have eight or far more men's sports, but have fewer than eight women's sports, and that situation will increase if you vote for this amendment. It almost certainly is going to be the women who, first of all, have fewer than eight sports. So I would strongly recommend keeping a broad-base program for both men and women in ensuring that those schools

that want to have a broad-base program are competing against other schools in similar situations. To do that, you vote against this proposal to reduce the number of required sports. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 59 (page A-43) was defeated 53-59.]

[Note: Action on Proposal No. 60 was postponed until after Proposal No. 56 could be considered.]

[Proposal No. 90 was withdrawn.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Lonnie D. Kliever (Southern Methodist University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

I will speak in favor of Proposal No. 103. SMU is one of some 20 universities that competed in the Mirage Bowl, and we are cosponsors of the legislation before us. Let me speak on two matters. One is, why are we sponsoring and cosponsoring this legislation? Two, why is this legislation needed?

Our strong support of this proposal is born out of our experience in the Mirage Bowl two years ago. I think it is safe to say no experience that our student-athletes and those other students of our student body will accompany the team to the Mirage Bowl will have the experience that contributes more to their education than the Mirage Bowl trip.

This is an athletics event where the student in our beloved hyphenated phrase "student-athlete" is memorably and educationally served. Why is this legislation needed? The present Mirage Bowl is restricted to inviting teams that already are scheduled to play one another, and this limits the freedom that arises sometimes in competitiveness of participating teams. The present exception of the Mirage Bowl from the 11-game limit, which is strictly limited to I-A membership participants, will give the Mirage Bowl the flexibility it feels it needs to put together an affair that reflects the geographical and institutional diversity of Division I-A. The legislative limitation of frequency of participation will ensure a wide distribution of participation among members in Division I-A.

William D. Bradford (Duke University): Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to the Mirage Bowl in any way, but you will recall that we are working on a moratorium on the number of contests for at least a year until we can properly assess, along with the Presidents Commission, the demands on the student-athlete's time. So I would submit that perhaps we should hold off on this for the time being rather than begin to increase contests and plan opportunities until we have an overview of it. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 103 (page A-69) was defeated.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Bailey: That concludes the actions on the items on the agenda with the exception of one that has been deferred for action until tomorrow morning. We are ready now to proceed with discussion of the items that will be before Division I. I emphasize again the importance of as full a discussion as possible among Division I-A membership so that we may have time to complete the Division I agenda. Do you desire any discussion of Proposals No. 14 or 15? If not, we will move to Proposal No. 16.

Academics

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): We are passing out the most recent data from two committees—the Research Committee and the Special NCAA Committee on Academic Standards. We did reruns on all of the data that we have based on those that passed the core curriculum, which we had not done before. I call your attention to the 1982 data, because we believe that that data is more significant than the 1977 data. However, the 1977 data will give you graduation rates at various points. These tables are self-explanatory, and I will give you a minute to look at these tables. I might comment that the national data that is in there from ACT confirms what we tried to do in Proposal No. 16. It is very close and the numbers will qualify for ACT.

Those of us who have worked in this area for about two years believe rather strongly that Proposal No. 16 is not an elimination of the standards. I have a personal belief about rigid academic standards. I think the admissions offices in this country, and I have heard them say so many times, believe Proposal No. 16 is flexible. We do look at individuals, we try to make the best educational decisions, and I think that staying with 5-1-(j) as it is as a hard and fast test-score rule is not what is in the best interest of most of our universities. That is a pesonal belief that I have. I think Proposal No. 16 gives us some flexibility for students.

Paul W. Gikas (University of Michigan): With the current NCAA bylaws, there are no qualitative standards for academic progress. The term "good academic standards requirement" that we list is nebulous. The definition of good academic standing varies over a wide spectrum within our member institutions. As a matter of fact, the term good academic standing even varies within schools and colleges within a given institution. Adoption of these reasonable grade-point-average requirements would provide a uniform standard by which we measure academic progress. Currently no such standard exists. When we admit students from high school, we require the grade-point average. It seems logical to follow from that we will require grade-point average during their college metriculation. This grade-point requirement is reasonable. It starts out below a 2.000, and it allows the period of adjustment for the student who is under pressure in a new environment competing, and gradually works up to a 2.000, which most of our institutions require for graduation.

Mr. Bailey: May I ask if the proposal provides for counting in the GPA the overall GPA on all courses taken?

Mr. Gikas: Yes, the grade-point average would be calculated by the member institutions as they calculate it for all their students. Whatever their procedure now is for calculating grade-point average for all their students is what would be done.

Mr. Bailey: We will move to Proposal No. 18—the change with respect to the period for academic reporting. I think you will note that that simply is a change in the time period for which the date will be presented in a given year and is designed to provide more time for the reporting institution so that there will be less time pressure from the end of that period covered until the submission of the report. That, I think, is essentially a technical change.

I will call your attention to Proposal No. 6 in the consent package just to be sure that we understand. Proposal No. 6 is of particular interest certainly to Division I-A and, of course, to all of Division I. When the academic requirement for professional eligibility was adopted, it was generally understood,

I believe, by the Division I membership that the courses in the core curriculum would be passed and a 2.000 grade-point average on those core courses would be required.

The wording of Bylaw 5-1-(j) does not explicitly provide for that. The Academic Requirements Committee has been concerned about this, the Council has been concerned; and as we approach the implementation, there has been consideration during the past months on how to achieve what was clearly understood by those voting for this requirement to be the intent and purpose. Consideration was given by reaching that by interpretation. The alternative of an amendment to Bylaw 5-1-(j) to incorporate explicit wording for satisfactory completion of the minimal 11 core courses was concluded to be the more prudent alternative. Because of possible complications with respect to that, the effective date is for the fall of 1987. Hopefully, this will be understood; and it will be recognized that this simply is accomplishing what many of us thought had been accomplished in the original language. Hopefully, there will be no compelling concern to remove this from the consent package and debate the issue.

Ira Michael Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): At the special Convention last year, we had a special meeting of the presidents and chancellors of Division I-A institutions, and we agreed that the Division I-A members of the Presidents Commission should serve as a planning or steering committee for the Division I-A presidential interests. I want to report to the chief executive officers here today from Division I-A institutions that your Commission members have agreed to undertake that responsibility, and we will be reaching you shortly with some documents that indicate how that is going to work and how you, if you wish to, may participate in those undertakings.

[The Division I-A Business Session adjourned at 10 a.m.]

DIVISION I-AA BUSINESS SESSION

Monday Morning, January 13, 1986

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. by Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University, chair.

[Note: The reporter was not present at the beginning of the business session. The following begins with discussion in progress.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting Contacts

[Note: A motion had been made and seconded for the adoption of Proposal No. 43, and a motion had been made and seconded for the adoption of Proposal No. 43—1. The following begins with a discussion of Proposal No. 43—1.]

Andrew T. Mooradian (University of New Hampshire): I think that that motion at this time is out of order because we are on the amendment to the amendment.

John H. Randolph (College of William and Mary): Three things bother me about this proposal. One is, I fail to see how it is going to be easier to enforce 12 contacts or 13 contacts, depending on the year, as opposed to three contacts. Secondly, I think this introduces an already highly competitive venue. In football, it becomes more difficult and almost mandatory that you visit the prospect 12 times at the high school, therefore, you really hike up the cost to keep up with the Joneses. Thirdly, if I understand you correctly, Andy, during that 12- or 13-week period, there is a moratorium in effect in recruiting in all the other sports; in that if one representative of the football staff comes into a high school, no other coach will be permitted from another sport to represent an institution. Is that correct?

Mr. Mooradian: That is correct.

Mr. Randolph: Thank you.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): If we do not adopt the amendment 43—1 and leave in the words would there still be a moratorium on recruiting for other sports?

Mr. Mooradian: Yes, I think there would be. The thing why that changed was the wording so that we could have the intent that it is once a week for any purpose. You would not go in on Monday, talk to the prospect. Now, we go in on Tuesday to check the grades with the guidance director. Now we go in Wednesday to check his character with the principals. For any purpose, you could go in only once a week.

Mr. Orleans: Under Proposal No. 43, at least technically, if there is a similar football recruit at the school, there can only be one visit per week no matter how many other young people are involved or for what other sport?

Mr. Mooradian: Right.

Robert A. Latour (Bucknell University): As I recall, when we went to three contacts some years ago, I remember someone came to the microphone speaking for the guidance counselors and secondary school people. That was one of the reasons why we went to three, not only to save money but also to prevent too much interference at the high school level with classes and so forth. It seems to me this is putting us right back to where we were before to some extent.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): This is a Division I-A issue

primarily. We have not had this problem in Division I-AA whatsoever. It does affect all of us, but it is a Division I-A issue.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): At one time or another, I have to wear two hats in terms of supervising teaching as well as doing some more things at the university. Now, what happens if a football coach goes into high school "H" on Tuesday, and I have to go into there on Wednesday to evaluate a student teacher? Are you saying that I cannot go in on Wednesday?

Mr. Mooradian: I would not say that. I would not interpret that to interfere with going in to supervise a student that is teaching or practice teaching. I would not interpret it that way at all.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I move to divide Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded and was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-32) was defeated (27-46).]

[Note: Later in the meeting a motion was made and seconded to reconsider Proposal Nos. 43 and 43—1. However, the motion was withdrawn.]

Football Coaching Staff

Mr. Doland: The next presentation is Proposal No. 87. This has been before the group before. It is not a new proposition. I will take the time right now to explain the reason for this legislation and then give ample time for those who are for or against it to speak. I will go through this a little more lengthily than some of you may need, but there may be some new people in here.

In 1975, Division I-A institutions reduced coaching staffs from 13, 14 and up to 16 at many institutions to the eight full-time and two part-time assistants that we presently have. This action allowed many institutions and others to be competitive in both on-field coaching and recruiting. Use of part-time coaches was abused in Division I-A, so it was eliminated in 1983. They elected to change to nine full-time and no part-time assistants. This left us in Division I-AA with the remaining numbers, simply because they were there. Now there is no limit at this time on graduates or student assistants serving as coaches. There is no limit, but they cannot recruit off campus.

In Division I-AA, we have a current limit of eight assistants and the two part-time coaches, a total of potentially ten assistant coaches. This number causes inequities and unnecessary expenses for many institutions in trying to keep up. Now, why go to seven? The vast majority of the Division I-AA institution in this room operate with seven or fewer, some with as few as four, and most with six and seven total coaches. All coaches in football want equal scholarships and as closely as possible request equal number of coaches. This is inherent. We must keep our Division I-AA competitive and, in my opinion, spend no more than necessary on such things or we will lose many more institutions. This year, due to financial problems and other things, we have lost greatly.

Last year we limited scholarships to 70 full-time grants. This helped many conferences and schools stay competitive. One assistant coach's salary plus related benefits plus recruiting costs equals at least, and sometimes as many as, ten scholarships. This money could be better used; since in many of our opinions, seven coaches should be able to handle the 70 scholarship players and students with graduate assistants and student assistants unlimited and used as needed.

This legislation requires no firing of any current coaches; it is handled by attrition.

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Note: The Division I-AA Business session voted to consider Proposal No. 88 ahead of No. 87.]

Mr. Orleans: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

If I could just have a moment of our time to explain this. As the rules currently are written, those schools that have both separate freshman and junior varsity teams are able to have a limited number of additional part-time assistant coaches; and the Proposal No. 88 would simply preserve that limited number of part-time assistants for institutions that have not only varsity programs, but both junior varsity and freshman football programs.

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): I would remind the delegates that in order to have additional coaches, you must have a varsity, a freshman and a junior varsity program; and I would suspect that most institutions outside of the Ivy League in Division I-AA do not have that. I would urge that we pass this in consideration of their special needs.

[Proposal No. 88 was approved by Division I-AA.]

Mr. Doland: We will continue with our consideration of Proposal No. 87 at this time.

Larry Lacewell (Arkansas State University): I do not mind the reduction in staff members. I currently have eight. I have no part-timers, but there have been years when I have had part-timers. I know of no abuse in Division I-AA on part-timers. I have had individuals who did not want to go to graduate school to become a graduate assistant, and I was able to secure for these people a very small amount of money.

I also represent the American Football Coaches Association; and I am sure your first thought is, every coach is going to want more and more and more. What we really are concerned about is the fact that we feel that it will cut down our teacher-coach relationship. For example, it was pointed out that Division I-AA had many programs with more athletes than Division I-A. There are schools that have as many as 125-150 athletes, walk-ons, out; and they feel that we do need these part-timers. The staff reduction would reduce our teacher-to-pupil relationship.

I know you can have graduate assistants. I have no problem with that, but at the same time, we do have individuals who will come to you, wanting to coach for almost nothing. Frankly, if there have been cases of abuse in I-AA, I really have not found it.

[Proposal No. 87 as amended by No. 88 (page 1-60) was approved.]

[Note: The balance of the business session was devoted to discussing Proposal Nos. 14, 15 and 16. There were no substantive points made that were different from those included in the Division I Business Session proceedings. Therefore, the Division I-AA discussions are not included here.]

[The Division I-AA Business Session was adjourned at approximately 11 a.m.]

DIVISION I-AAA BUSINESS SESSION

Monday Morning, January 13, 1986

The Division I-AAA Business Session was convened at approximately 9 a.m. by Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton, chair.

[Note: The reporter was not present at the beginning of the business session. Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Academics

The Very Reverend L. Edward Glynn, St. Peter's College and a member of the Presidents Commission, led a discussion of Proposal No. 16, which would amend Bylaw 5-1-(j). He noted that it is a compromise position that maintains both the grade-point average in a core curriculum and text scores to determine eligibility but uses a sliding scale that allows one area to make up for deficiencies in another. It also was noted that neither Bylaw 5-1-(j) nor Proposal No. 16 prohibits anyone from attending college. It was pointed out by some members of the division that Bylaw 5-1-(j) would have significant impact on those people who have the least ability to pay and in some cases have the greatest need for access to higher education and that Proposal No. 16 is a compromise position that has been developed by the Presidents Commission and supported by the NCAA Council. There also was discussion of Proposal Nos. 14, 15, 17 and 18. A straw vote indicated that more delegates were opposed to both 14 and 15 than were in favor but that No. 16 appeared to have a few more in favor than opposed.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Father Glynn again led the discussion, noting that Proposal No. 19 was an attempt to hold, in addition to both the institution and members of the athletics department staff, a student-athlete accountable if the institution is involved in violations. Under No. 19, student-athletes would be responsible for their involvement in violations of NCAA regulations and would have their eligibility restored only when circumstances clearly warranted restoration. Furthermore, the Eligibility Committee would be required to report the basis for restoration of eligibility in cases involving "major" violations. Proposal No. 20 would limit the available number of contests that do not count toward the maximum number of allowable contests. Father Glynn pointed out that the proposal was in response to the results of a survey conducted in 1985 in which college and university presidents indicated their desire for limits on the length of playing seasons. It noted that a resolution would be submitted by the Presidents Commission in the General Business Session indicating the desire of the presidents as a counter to the lengthy group of proposals to be acted upon that would increase the length of seasons.

Financial Aid

It was noted that Proposal No. 22 would be withdrawn and that the figure used in Proposal No. 24 for the amount of a Pell Grant was greater than the number for the average program but not as great as the amount for the maximum program.

General

Proposal No. 37 was discussed, and it was noted that there would be a motion in the Division I meeting to postpone discussion of the proposal until it could be considered with Proposal No. 56 in the General Business Session. It was argued that No. 37, which would eliminate the Men's and Women's Division I Indoor Track Championships, might cause some institutions to drop indoor track from their programs. In a straw vote, there was indication that Proposal Nos. 37 and 56 would not be supported by Division I-AAA.

Governance

Proposal No. 80, which would permit legislative autonomy for Division I-AAA in the divided bylaws, except for the provisions specified in the legislation, and would establish an annual legislative meeting during the summer, was discussed. It was noted that there is controversy within both Division I-AA and Division I-AAA on the issue. A number of speakers expressed concern that the legislation would further divide Division I and would be another step toward five divisions within the Association. It also was acknowledged that the proposed legislation would give Division I-AAA the authority to deal with proposals that apply only to the division. A straw vote indicated more opposed to the proposal than in favor of it.

Playing and Practice Seasons

There was considerable discussion regarding the various proposals dealing with length of seasons. It was noted that a resolution would be introduced in the General Business Session, as indicated above, supporting the limitations on the number of contests. Several speakers discussed particular proposals dealing with specific sports. A straw voted indicated that in general the delegates were opposed to the limits.

DIVISION I BUSINESS SESSION

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1986

The Division I Business Session was called to order at 2:45 p.m., with Division I Vice-President Arliss Roaden presiding.

Vice-President Roaden: Ladies and gentlemen, we shall get underway with this business session, and I shall call to your attention that we shall take action this afternoon on matters that are pertinent exclusively to Division I. We have a limited period of time for our work this afternoon. If we are unable to get through all of the items, it will be necessary for us to carry those over to the General Business Session beginning tomorrow.

We also need to vote on Council members and other nominees from our Nominating Committee. If there are no objections, I should like to request your permission to change the order of our agenda to take care of those elections as the first item of business.

[*Note: The slate of candidates for the NCAA Council and the Division I vice-president was presented. A motion was made and seconded to elect the slate by acclamation. The slate was approved.*]

We will now move to consideration of legislative items. The first three items to be considered by Division I are Proposals Nos. 14, 15 and 16. You will note that those three proposals have been designated by the Presidents Commission to require roll call votes. We will take these in sequential order beginning with No. 14. During the roll call voting process, if there are no objections, we will leave that cluster of items that are related and move on to the next unrelated item, which will be No. 17, so that we can have discussion underway and not lose any time while we wait for the tabulation of the roll call vote.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

Joseph B. Johnson (Grambling State University): Mr. Chair, I am chair of the NAFO Committee on Athletics, which represents 114 historically and predominantly black institutions; and I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

I rise in support of Proposal No. 14, because today if there is any integrity, any morality and any shame left in this organization, I would suggest that this is the most appropriate time to show it by your vote on this proposal. Why? Because it is the right thing to do, ladies and gentlemen. All of the evidence gathered since 1983 shows that a great travesty of justice will be perpetrated on thousands of young men and women if Bylaw 5-1-(j) goes into effect in 1986.

This has been clearly evidenced by the \$300,000 NCAA study that clearly indicates Bylaw 5-1-(j) discriminates against black student-athletes. This is evidenced by the many studies commissioned on campuses. This is evidenced by the statements of the experts from the testing data center that were responsible for administering the tests to be used. This is also evidenced by the multiplicities of figures that show a high school grade point average usually is a better measurement than standardized test scoring as predictor of success in college. I want to make myself perfectly clear. We, the members of NAFO, the members of the Southwestern Athletic Conference, and the members of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference support academic standards as we stated in

1983. We have supported the core curriculum, the 2,000 grade-point average then, and we support it today because we still believe it is the best prediction of success in college. Also, we support testing when it is used correctly.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is academically a hypocrisy for any educator to stand before you and insult your intelligence by attempting to convince you that they are all right in using the ACT and the SAT as implied in Bylaw 5-1-(j). The issue today is not what the test purports to measure, but the real issue is about how the test is to be used. That needs to be made very clear today. The current trend to establish relative academic standards for college athletes emanating primarily from a small group of misguided and misdirected elitist members of this organization, who have acknowledged they are embarrassed by the historic exploitation of black student-athletes. Their claim of tough academic standards has widely been publicized by the media. This evidence seems a simplistic attempt to reestablish the credibility and loss of integrity of many athletics programs in their institution.

What you must understand is there has been a profit motive in using the black student-athlete. Black student-athletes at these institutions have never been considered educational entities; they have been an industrial commodity. Some of these institutions, like during the period of slavery, have built their programs and launched their stadiums and field houses and built large athletics endowments off the backs of these black athletes. Now, they are saying to them, "We don't need you anymore. There are too many of you on our campuses."

This group of elitist institutions and their supporters are trying to legislate credibility and integrity in their athletics programs through Bylaw 5-1-(j). By adopting Bylaw 5-1-(j), these college presidents are blinded by a racially selected sympathy and indifference. Like our black racial hostilities, selective racial indifference reflected at the least of the concerns of minorities are not worthy to the same degree paid to problems perceived by whites. It takes only the smallest of inferential leaks to conclude that the decision to implement Bylaws 5-1-(j) obviously has a discriminating effect, representing at the very least selective racial sympathy and indifference.

The U.S. Supreme Court has long recognized the principle that the U.S. Constitution nullifies sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination. We supporters think that this represents a paraphrase of Justice Thurgood Marshall's scathing decision of the majority opinion in *Mobile vs. Bowman*. The formulation of Bylaw 5-1-(j) is an excellent example of how these concepts can be applied to denying black people protection and equal opportunity. Bylaw 5-1-(j) will definitely have a disproportionate and insidious impact upon black student-athletes, and those who propose it knew it.

Proposal No. 14 puts forth an alternative to Bylaw 5-1-(j). It focuses on the core curriculum and drops the requirements for a minimum standardized test score. I ask you today to keep in mind that Bylaw 5-1-(j) in the views of the test score is racially discriminatory. The legislation has nothing to do with what these tests attempt to measure but instead how they are used to exclude and to discriminate. Those of you who know me know that I am a proponent of excellence and quality in education but only when it is fair and will not deter opportunity. The same schools that destroyed our television package are now prepared to destroy our eligibility package.

I know you are familiar with our concerns, and I ask the question: Will 5-1-

(j) be the NCAA's apartheid? I hope not. I ask your support of this legislation.

Percy A. Pierre (Prairie View A&M University): Many alternatives to Bylaw 5-1-(j) were considered in the NCAA study that President Johnson just referred to. The SWAC, along with the MEAC, selected Proposal No. 14 for those alternatives. I would like to point out to you that that study, the NCAA study, did show that Proposal No. 14 will be effective in solving the problems addressed. Now, let's go back to the problem. What was the problem identified? The problem was the low rate of graduation of certain student-athletes and particularly black athletes. Those black graduates were the problem.

Approaching that problem, we have to do two things. One, discourage those students who should not have been students, and that is what Bylaw 5-1-(j) is all about. But, secondly, to find ways of graduating more of those students who did not graduate. Proposal No. 14 does, in fact, encourage even students who should not be in college.

Proposal No. 14 by itself, according to the study, would raise graduation rates from 31 percent to 46 percent by itself. But that should not be our only approach to the problem. We should also find a way of graduating more of those students who do not graduate.

I feel that the academic progress rule is a significant step in that direction. You know the academic progress rule will make it so that when a student-athlete finds his eligibility he will be geared to graduation in a degree program. That is essential. We do not believe we ought to have one type of approach to the problem. We also must encourage those who are not in college, but we should encourage those who are not now graduating but should graduate.

Luno I. Mishoe (Delaware State College): I shall be brief, Mr. Chair. I just want to make three points. First is that the core academic curriculum, which the NCAA plans to require in English, mathematics, social science and natural science, is good and represents the most accurate, the most fair and perhaps the most efficient way to predict academic success for students entering college. This has been assumed through statistical marks and through practice over the many years. I would just mention incidentally that if one examines the regression marks developed by using the core curriculum (mathematics, English and the sciences) and then examines the multiple regression mark developed by adding the SAT score to the core curriculum and calculate the reliability, how well you can depend on each of the models, you will find, which I am sure we already know, that the fewer academic mark has just as good a reliability in its prediction capacity as the other.

No. 2, the NCAA plan to use SAT scores to make yes/no decisions on the eligibility of students to participate in athletics is a misuse of test results. I do not have to develop a debate on that point. Since 1983, we have heard experts proclaim and provide information in support of this fact.

No. 3, the decision to use test results in this manner is subjective. I know of no mathematical model or regression model that would allow SAT test results to exercise a veto on which students should or should not participate in athletics.

Mr. Chair, I speak as a professional mathematician and a statistician on this point.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): Today at our banquet, I was struck by the words of Vice-President Bush who stated that this is the greatest country in the world. It is a country dedicated to the democratic

principles and processes of democracy. We represent the freest country in the world. In fact, he noted that he was leaving this meeting to go to another country in celebration of their attempt to move into a democracy.

In America, the democratic process works extremely well in our American society. As higher educational institutions, we are the guardians of our culture. We are the bastions of objective thought, and most precious of all we are the searchers of truth. We have the utmost responsibility to be protective of our valued traditions. We must respect at the highest level the freedom of speech and the freedom to dissent.

I submit to my colleagues today that there is much that has occurred in the process of reform in academics that we cannot be very proud of in the pursuit of Proposal No. 48. If I am to believe the comments, the whisperings, the private conversations, there are many of us who do not see Proposal No. 48 as the correct approach to end our problems in academics. But we will not vote our convictions because we say that to be against Proposal No. 48 is not to have the most political expedient possible. We find much that we disagree with it, but we are afraid to say so to the world because we do not want to be labeled as persons who are against academic standards. Yet, we know that fundamentally Bylaw 5-1-(j) does not cure the problem that we are now facing with academics in athletics.

I would urge my colleagues, first, to stand up and be counted today, to stand up for what this country is all about. Do not stand and be brow beaten because somebody in power has said to you that you cannot speak your voice and cannot speak your mind. Do not denigrate this great country of ours by not speaking your voice. I ask you to vote your convictions and your private feelings and things that you feel utmost about fairness and justice to the athletes that we have brought to our universities.

Secondly, I want to say to you that the flaws in our athletes and their performances on our campuses is not largely the responsibility of the athletes. It is largely the responsibility of us, the institutions. We control, we sat by and we did not act and so we came to this day. Our solution to the problem is to make it tougher for the athletes. Where is the self-introspection in this organization? Where is the requirement on the institutions and its leadership and the people who run our athletics program? Academic standards is a valid responsibility of each institution, its faculty and its board. We should not really relegate the making of academic standards to the NCAA. Academics in character, truth, honesty are words that we utter with great piousness all the time. What is the most academically sound thing to do in respect to the student-athlete that we bring to your campuses? Admit student-athletes to our institutions who reflect the normal admission standards of our universities. That is the most honorable thing to do to athletes in the NCAA situation.

We have seen manifested in these deliberations the influence of a power heaped upon those who are not necessarily a part of the power elite. That influence really gives the message that we have much, much distance to go in terms of maintaining the powers of the world that we utter from higher education.

Now, why is it important to have a single standard for all of the division schools in Division I, I-A, I-AA and I-AAA? There is much unequal in our institutions. We have unequal admissions standards for all of our students. We pride ourselves on the diversity of higher education. We have certainly a great difference in recruiting budgets. We have a great difference in athletics budgets,

the highest being about \$13 million or \$14 million. But despite the diversity that we have in higher education with respect to our admissions standards, we all seek excellence in our education, our activities. I simply want to say to you vote your conviction.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): Mr. Chair, I am speaking in support of Proposal No. 14 also. It would eliminate the use of the standardized test scores; and while the standardized test score is better than no information at all as far as predicting success in college, it is far from perfect. It is less perfect for our black athletes than for our nonblack athletes. If it is not perfect, then we know we will have error involved. That is the issue I would like to address today. What kind of error are you prepared to make?

I would like to make an analogy of us being a jury in a murder trial. There are four possible decisions that we can make. The first one is saying guilty. That is an imprudent decision. If not guilty, we say they are not guilty; and then we make the right decision. But we could make two errors. We could say a person is guilty when, if fact, they were not, or they could be guilty and we could let them go free. Those are two decidedly different errors.

We have that same situation before us when we consider the standardized test score. We can admit a student who is a marginal student and perhaps who does not make it to graduation. That is one kind of error. Or we can reject a student who is a marginal student who would not have been successful. So there are two possible kinds of errors.

As we look at our data, we know that if Proposal No. 14 is not passed we will be rejecting at least a third of the students that could have been successful. That is the error that I personally am not prepared to make. I think I would much rather let somebody marginal in, give them the guidance and academic help if they need it. If they are not successful, for whatever reason, that is much less of an error than to reject somebody who could come to our institution and be successful.

We proffered the academic success of the marginal student long before we all discussed Proposal No. 48. We have some very encouraging data of good graduation rate, although not as high as those that had the SAT of 700 and ACT of 15. Encouraging enough that with our new satisfactory progress rule, I would like to have the institutions set the standards and not somebody set an arbitrary standard that would eliminate some people that could be very successful.

[Proposal No. 14 (page A-8) was defeated (47-289, seven abstentions.)]

[Note: The voting results for Proposal No. 14 were announced later in the meeting but are included here for ease of reference.]

Satisfactory Progress

Paul W. Gikas (University of Michigan): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently in the NCAA bylaws, there is no qualitative standard for academic progress. The good academic standard requirement is nebulous. The definition of a good academic standard covers a wide spectrum among our member institutions. Some institutions do not even publish the definition in their catalogs. It not only varies between the institutions but it varies among the schools and colleges within the given institution. There is no uniformity.

Adoption of these responsible grade-point-average requirements as delineated in the proposal would provide a uniform standard by which we measure academic progress. We recognize there is a minority of institutions where a pass/fail system is used. In some institutions, a 5.000 grade point is used instead of a 4.000. We believe that these types of grade assistance should not be a barrier to the provisions of Proposal No. 17.

The appropriate administrative committee of the Association can assign numerical equivalents to the various components of the pass/fail system and, likewise, to the 5.000 system and relate these specifically to a numerical grade-point average. This is logically possible. The grade-point average would be calculated for those schools that use the grade-point average, would be calculated as it is for all students at that institution and not just the special method graphic, the way they do it for all students at this institution. I urge the passage of Proposal No. 17.

[Proposal No. 17 (page A-10) was defeated (134-178).]

Academic Reporting

Richard W. Burns (University of Texas, El Paso): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

In our wisdom last year, Division I voted that we have an academic reporting requirement that goes in effect August 1, 1985. The legislation currently in effect requires us to report graduate rates by October 1, 1986. That includes the 1985-86 academic year. The Council believes that this probably is too short of a time to complete and accurately report the data. Therefore, we propose in No. 18 that the graduation data be based on the class that began in attendance six years before the report is due rather than five. That eliminates the time problem in getting all the data together accurately, and it does not weaken the rule in any way. Hopefully, this is a noncontroversial issue.

[Proposal No. 18 (page A-10) was approved.]

[A motion to postpone consideration of Proposal No. 37—A until the General Business Session was seconded and approved.]

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

Percy A. Pierre (Prairie View A&M University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 15 differs from Proposal No. 14 primarily in reference to SAT scores. It is a significant difference. It does several things for us. First of all, it makes a strong reinforcement for the use of tests. Were there any questions about our support of the proper use of tests, this proposal would eliminate that. It would put the NCAA on record as believing that these tests were useful.

Secondly, it would support that part of the solution that involves helping students to graduate by using the tests to please us and get more graduates from that pool of nongraduates.

Thirdly, it will allow us to gather data from all the Division I institutions over the next few years to ascertain whether we need further modification of Proposal No. 15. I need not go over all the reasons why we feel that Bylaw 5-1-(j) misuses tests. I think all of us as educators understand those tests. I would just cite one number and hope that you would remember it and bring it back

with you to your campuses. Of all the black male athletes that graduated, 70 percent would be disqualified by Bylaw 5-1-(j). In other words, Bylaw 5-1-(j) discourages successful students, discourages graduates. That is the only number that I would like for you to remember.

Now, it has been said, "We really are not stopping students from graduating; they simply cannot play football or basketball. What harm is that?" I think most of you know, and we know, that a student is academically better off in Division I in athletics programs than outside of programs. We have had a major study of that issue by ETS, and the data is clear that students in athletics programs perform better than students of similar capabilities not in athletics programs. There are benefits in being in an athletics program. To arbitrarily and capriciously deny students the benefit of an athletics program, it seems to me, is something that we should not do.

Another argument made in support of Proposal No. 16 is that if we just wait a little while, the problem will go away. All the bad features of Bylaw 5-1-(j) will go away in two years, and we can revert to Bylaw 5-1-(j). I submit that that feature will not go away. The most likely change over the next few years is that more and more students will satisfy the core curriculum, I agree. But nothing this Convention is going to do will solve the problem of the gap in SAT scores between whites and Blacks, between whites and Hispanics, between rich and poor. The differences in SAT scores of students is a functional factor far beyond this Convention.

So any suggestion that suddenly the gap between white and black schools will be racially geared is not tenable. Proposal No. 16 does modify Bylaw 5-1-(j), but it does not do it adequately. It does not solve the problem of Bylaw 5-1-(j). We feel that Proposal No. 15, as I said earlier, addresses the problem of graduation by discouraging those who should not be in school, by encouraging those who should be, and that way we will get the graduation rates up. Thank you.

Jack V. Doland (McNeese State University): Our research has shown that the ACT and SAT scores are very good for placement purposes. Along with this, I refer to the fact that poor predictors of future success and graduation from colleges have an adverse effect on the black communities.

Bylaw 5-1-(j) raises core curriculum of the 2.000 to a realistic 2.400. Many of you would vote against the 2.400 if that were on the agenda, but that is what it does because we eliminate anything but the core curriculum. We have now raised standards without the test score to 2.400. We need more research on the test scores, we need to see what it does more, we need a further study of it. Proposal No. 15 does that. The students take the test, and then we evaluate their results over a period of time. The 2.000 in the core curriculum raises the standard considerably.

Now, we had the test scores from 1960 and 1972 as a part of the initial entrance. It did not work out. Nothing has changed on the testing programs of the United States since 1972 when we got rid of the test scores. Nothing has changed. We took the 2.000, even though it was too low, because we wanted to get away from the test scores. I still believe we need to consider strongly getting away from the test scores for initial entries to participate in athletics in many of our institutions.

The green sheet that I have in my hand shows the disparity between whites and Blacks. It also shows another disparity between the ACT and the SAT. Many of us in some areas use only the ACT. We are impacted more heavily

than those who use the SAT. So there are many problems that need to be studied, and I recommend strongly that you consider seriously Proposal No. 15.

Maceo Nance Jr. (South Carolina State College): I rise to declare my support for academic excellence, integrity in intercollegiate athletics, fairness and honesty within this organization. I emphasize academic excellence because since 1983 at any time any of us dared to raise our voices in opposition to Proposal No. 48, we were immediately labeled as being in opposition to academic excellence within our institutions. Such an accusation cannot be further from the truth. I think we need to review in our own minds how we arrived at the point that we are at today.

Some of our colleagues, members of this august body, got their hands caught in the cookie jar; and they were embarrassed about some of the things taking place on their campuses. Almost in a clandestine way, a group of individuals met and decided that they wanted to do something about it to get themselves off of the hot seat and tried to think of a vehicle to accomplish that. They even associated themselves with another entity outside of this organization to give legitimacy perhaps to the concern that they were addressing, which is primarily an educational concern and should remain in the educational community and within the institution in the community and the educational organizations within our society.

From the very beginning, fairness and honesty were not present in that the broad representation on the matters such as this were not found within the committees. Later it was determined that that might be appropriate and some persons were invited to participate. Beyond that, individuals were allowed to provide information, engage in discussions, but to no avail in terms of positions which they returned.

I think a very basic simple question could be asked. If we are concerned about the academic performance and qualification of our athletes, why single out Division I-AA? It is almost like a mathematical equation if you carry it to its most logical conclusion. If, indeed, I-A has more palatable athletes, then one could chronologically conclude that it takes less time in practice and involvement in athletics as opposed to Division III. No one is talking about Division II or Division III. I think a matter as important as this matter ought to be addressed collectively by this organization throughout the organization covering all divisions. I think that we are fronting the advice of the experts, the persons who design the standardized tests, the persons who sell them.

The data showed, the study that the NCAA conducted itself showed, that these tests are not designed for the purpose for which we are suggesting that they be used. I would suggest that the lesser of the evils will be Proposal No. 15. At least the integrity of the institutions would be saved and many of us could go forward and develop the kinds of programs that we are desirous of developing within our own guidelines and within the integrity of our own institutions, which I think is very important.

Peter Lekins (Lehigh University): A few moments ago I voted against Proposal No. 14, but I will vote for Proposal No. 15. It seems to me that we need more information in order to be confident in our perhaps optimistic projection that the 1977 data will be sufficiently improved upon so that by the time 1986, 1987, 1988 roll around, we will not have the excessive burden upon the black students that the 1977 data would indicate to be there.

I also would remind you that this matter is not simply a racial matter. If we

look at the same data that you have been provided on the green sheets, they tell us that at least four of the cohort that came in as freshmen in 1977, approximately one-third of the students, Black and white of the male students who would have been declared ineligible, did, in fact, graduate. We are doing something wrong with Bylaw 5-1-(j) and we had better study it more carefully as Proposal No. 15 permits.

I would like to address a slightly different issue. The issue is the process that was followed to arrive at Proposal No. 16. This morning, Tom Frericks, in giving the Council report, addressed the issue of the democratic process and indicted how you use it. Resolution No. 25, passed at the last Convention, required the Council and the Presidents Commission to present a single specific proposal for modification of Bylaw 5-1-(j) and that additional flexibility would be desirable.

Now, the NCAA Council initially opposed the proposal that was recommended by the Presidents Commission. The Council did not make a definitive decision at its October meeting. The Division I Steering Committee was also initially opposed to Proposal No. 16. The president of the Association was instructed to reach a compromise with the Presidents Commission. The president also was instructed to inform the Commission of the weaknesses in its proposal. It was the consensus of that Council meeting that the Council should support the position of the Division I Steering Committee. Some members of the Council cited the importance of the Council and the Commission agreeing on the proposal, on the proposed modification of Bylaw 5-1-(j). The Division I Steering Committee had a telephone conference call on November 1, 1985, the deadline for submission of amendments. A summary of the minutes or copies of the minutes, of course, do not appear in the report so I cannot comment on the discussion that took place. But somehow this proposal resulted in the Steering Committee and the Council agreeing to the proposal from the Commission in spite of the weaknesses submitted.

Having served on the Council and as an officer in this association, I am somewhat disturbed and disappointed at what appears to be a decision that was based upon political expediency. Only those who voted "no" wisely voted for the proposal. It certainly would be a shame and a stigma on this organization for anybody to have voted for Proposal 16 for political reasons rather than vote to do what is right.

Now, in the final analysis, the Council and the Presidents Commission voted in favor of Proposal No. 16 in spite of results of the NCAA study, which showed that the use of test scores are racially discriminatory. The Council and the Presidents Commission voted on Proposal No. 16 in spite of the recommendations from the Special Committee on Academic Standards. The Council and the Presidents Commission voted for Proposal No. 16 in spite of the weaknesses cited by the Steering Committee and the Council. The Presidents Commission voted for Proposal No. 16 in spite of the opposition by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.

Now, the NCAA has a history of following the recommendations of the committees that it appoints to do special problems, particularly special committees. In this case, you had a \$300,000 study that supported the contingent that the use of test scores was discriminatory. The process of arriving at the vote on Proposal No. 16 is somewhat incomprehensible, and I suggest that a great deal of insensitivity has been shown to a small but loyal segment of this Association. I urge you not to let the political considerations

override what is right.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): We began talking about academic integrity and academic excellence. It was my understanding that the Presidents Commission was looking for a way of determining academic risks, trying to determine whether an individual had the prospects of graduation. We have seen that 70 percent of those who did graduate would have failed the criteria that are presently being proposed in Bylaw 5-1-(j) in this 1977 NCAA survey. Therefore, we now are proposing that a test score that the Educational Testing Service says should not be used in this climate, which has been known to have a bias based upon socio-economic conditions, be used.

What started out as a question of academic integrity has become an issue of social justice. It is important, therefore, that we approve Proposed No. 15 in order that we implement the core curriculum immediately and give the NCAA Presidents Commission an opportunity to find other valid means of determining academic risks and prospects for graduation.

John W. Ryan (Indiana University, Bloomington): It had been my hope that at least in my status as a member of the Presidents Commission, I would not feel it necessary, in my own mind at least, to rise to speak to either Proposal Nos. 14 or 15. I want to commend all those responsible for bringing forward Proposal No. 15, because I think it is important that this Association and this Convention through its delegates have an opportunity to decide regarding the use of test scores as a criterion to determine eligibility for athletic competitions for freshmen.

I am opposed to Proposal No. 15, but I think it is a most worthy and most important, most timely, question to put before this Association. Let us decide again in this democratic fashion how the Association should apply criteria to the entering freshmen with regard to their eligibility. Mr. Chair, the hour is growing late; and I shall not take an extended time to attempt to correct for the record a number of errors that have been stated regarding the process by which the Commission, and I cannot speak for the Council, arrived at Proposal No. 16. I will not speak to No. 16, although I am appalled that a good deal of the time we should have been talking about Proposal No. 15 has been given over to a discussion of the item that may come up next, depending on the outcome of Proposal No. 15.

I would simply say for the record in explaining the propriety of the Presidents Commission procedure that at this very Convention time the Presidents Commission met, and again for the second time all of those present voted unanimously to support the proposition that may be taken up after we conclude this one. Thank you.

James H. Wharton (Louisiana State University): There have been some statements that in my mind represent errors of fact; and I only want to correct what I perceive to be misrepresentation of Bylaw 5-1-(j). We are not talking about access to higher education. We have identified students who are at risk, and I think most of us as academicians know that the achievement test scores in the lower percentile or in the lower 10 percent are at risk, especially in our major state universities. Now, we still recruit these students, still give them a grant-in-aid. But we must and we are obliged to give them a year of concentrated study to correct their deficiencies before they begin to compete as fully qualified college students.

Much has been said about the NCAA study. One must read that study very carefully to understand the outcome of that study. For the revenue sports,

predominantly football and men's basketball, students with lower achievement scores do, in fact, make a 2.000 average. Strangely, though, for the nonrevenue sports, and especially women's sports, the students with lower achievement test scores do not make the 2.000 average.

So, for those presidents who have studied transcripts of the poorly prepared students, I think you will know the answer as to how that comes about. Those students are majoring in eligibility, shopping for easy courses. Now, we will not have to do that under Bylaw 5-1-(j). We can give the students a year of concentrated study, and if they respond, then they will be on their way to getting a college degree. That is what Bylaw 5-1-(j) was about all along.

Finally, I believe that we are giving students an opportunity for an education rather than discriminating against them. All of those who have worked on Bylaw 5-1-(j) and supported it, I strongly feel that they had students—the poorly prepared students, Black, white, whatever—in mind when they proposed Bylaw 5-1-(j) in 1983.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): Just one point. There is no prohibition for major schools or institutions to set a standard higher than that declared by the NCAA. There is no prohibition on any individual institution to set a standard higher than the minimum required by the NCAA. That is up to the individual campus.

[Proposal No. 15 (page A-9) was defeated by Division I (66-233, five abstentions).]

[*Note: The voting results for Proposal No. 15 were announced later in the meeting but are included here for ease of reference.*]

Recruiting Contacts and Visitations

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 44 would prohibit a 2.000 nonqualifier in the first year of junior college from taking official visits to NCAA institutions. The thought is that it would slow down what becomes double recruiting for athletes that go through their senior year of being recruited and late in the year find out they do not have a 2.000 and start the process again as soon as they move into junior college. These are the same students that should be staying in class, staying in the community colleges and junior colleges, and not attending recruiting trips, which are not necessary since they are not going to be coming out of their junior colleges for two years.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-33) was approved by Division I.]

Men's Ice Hockey Recruiting

Otto Breitenbach (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fellow delegates, this is more or less a housekeeping piece of legislation that would permit ice hockey personnel to be able to have the opportunity to participate in the national tournament similar to many of our other sports. Ice hockey would appreciate the delegates according them this opportunity.

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-40) was approved.]

Division I Criteria

Della Durant (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would require that a Division I institution sponsor at least two team sports for men and at least two team sports for women. It would become effective this coming September. Therefore, each institution would have to meet the requirement in the 1986-87 academic year. When the sports sponsorship requirements for Division I classification were lowered to six sports per men and six per women last January, concern was expressed that an institution could meet the six sport requirements with a program involving as few as 35 and 36 total participants by using the lowest participation requirements in the individual sports. This proposal would at least require the institution to have two team sports, which generally involve more participants; and this would keep some semblance of a broad-base program. The team sports, for your information, are baseball, basketball, field hockey, football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, volleyball and water polo. All others are classified as individual sports.

It is my understanding that there are only about two dozen institutions in Division I that do not meet this requirement now and most, if not all, are in the women's program. I would say that Division II has a lower constitution requirement than Division I and already has adopted this proposal. I urge the support of the Division I membership.

[Proposal No. 57 (page A-42) was approved by Division I.]

Division I Criteria

Nora Lynn Finch (North Carolina State University): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is the philosophy of the Division I Women's Basketball Committee that those schools that desire eligibility for the championships and classification in Division I should play Division I schedules. Equally important, those schools that would like to be reclassified in Division I make that known and play a Division I schedule.

[Proposal No. 58 (page A-42) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition

Col. Harvey Schiller (U.S. Air Force Academy): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 78 is to allow participation by students beyond their 20th birthday if the participation occurs during time spent in the U.S. Armed Forces. Many high school students enter military service immediately following graduation at approximately 18 years of age. The normal life in their enlistment allows them time to mature and the opportunity to assimilate funds for college. Most are involved in some type of organized competition and should not be denied this participation. In fact, in many cases, this competition may not be voluntary. In addition, we should be aware of those individuals who may be ordered to extensive active duty as reservists or National

Guardsmen. Denial of participation raises legal issues of equal protection. For this reason and others, the present rule appears unenforceable.

I should mention that adoption of this legislation would not benefit the nation's service academies since students must not be beyond 21 years of age upon entry. Let us not deprive thousands of young people the opportunity to participate in any intercollegiate athletics at a university because they choose to serve their country in the armed forces of the United States.

Thomas J. Frericks (University of Dayton): Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this representing the Council. The Council feels the language is flawed and does not include all foreign services. There are potential legal ramifications with our allies in services of their countries as well.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): With all due respect to the Council's position on this issue, I really think a number of lawyers feel that it is entirely justifiable to permit the exception of the armed forces of the United States and not give the same exception to other armed forces. This is not the same kind of discrimination that we looked at several years ago when this proposal was before us. We were worried about discriminating against people who were aliens or not citizens. The armed forces exception, I think, is an honorable position and one entirely defensible.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-54) was approved.]

[*Note: Following the announcement of the voting results for Proposal No. 15, consideration of Proposal No. 16 began.*]

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

I. M. Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, as well as this whole subject, is obviously enormously controversial. But at this point the question is whether the rule implied in Bylaw 5-1-(j) is going to go into effect as of this coming fall or is going to be amended. The presentation of Proposal Nos. 14 and 15, even though they lost, reflect the passing of the opposition to the use of SAT or ACT minimum scores to determine eligibility. Others feel equally adamant against any change, and we might hear from them in the debate on this proposal.

For those who want to ignore aptitude scores, let me suggest that first the scores that are required are relatively minimal; that, secondly, the tests are an objective and independent outside measure of the academic quality of the high school curriculum, and that, thirdly, recent data seemed to show that aptitude scores of those who had completed the newly-required core curriculum had gone up. But this should not surprise us because there is obviously a linkage between taking an academic core curriculum and the kinds of scores one gets in aptitude tests.

For those who want no amendment to apply to Bylaw 5-1-(j) let me suggest, first, that a system of indexing test scores and grade-point averages as proposed to this two- or three-year period is used for admission judgment quite often. Secondly, while aptitude scores of minority youngsters appear to be rising with the imposition of the academic core curriculum requirement, the substantial data we have shows that through 1982, at least, the 700 SAT and 15 ACT scores have substantially different impact by academicians. Thirdly, the change

proposed here is relatively modest, an index to be used for two years rather than the standard in Bylaw 5-1-(j) being imposed today. Finally, a point that was made in the debate on Proposal No. 15. This two-year period will permit us to gather further data, which hopefully will evidence substantial gains in the aptitude scores as the academic curriculum standards take hold.

Given all of the above, the Division I representatives of the Presidents Commission and the Council are convinced of the wisdom of this proposed act.

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): On behalf of the Council, I urge the support of Proposal No. 16. I think it is appropriate to note that in recognition of the deficiencies that have been identified since the legislation was proposed and adopted and the recognition of the results of the data that we have provided since that time, it is pertinent that Proposal No. 16 would, in this period of transition, address an aspect of fairness that I think has not been specifically identified. That is fairness to individual students who may fall slightly below in this transition period, one or the other of these requirements, and who could be accommodated here without reducing in any appreciable way the academic validity of the requirements as it is stated.

We urge your support of this as we move into this period of transition. With the continued research and the support of the Division I institutions, it is obvious now that there is a commitment in the Association for the gathering of additional data over the next few years so that at some point in the future when there is the desire to improve the academic requirements, the standards that are part of the eligibility, that they will have more meaningful information.

Bruce R. Poulton (North Carolina State University): Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to setting the debate on standardized test scores aside. I think that at a time when many high schools are attempting to strengthen the academic requirements for competition at the scholastic level, this Convention should not send the message to the high schools that a GPA below 2.000 is acceptable for competition in college. Thank you.

Clifford F. Sjogen (University of Michigan): I am chair of the Academic Requirements Committee. I am also the representative of this Convention for the major professional association of registrars, the American Association of Registrar Admission Officers, and director of admissions at the University of Michigan. I strongly encourage the support of Proposal No. 16. While we are talking here about eligibility and not about admissions, I think a concept can be illustrated if we look at the admissions practice that virtually all colleges and universities in this country, those institutions that have any type of selective admissions, will practice in depth. In some institutions, this is formalized tests; and at other institutions, this is not formalized but still it is used. I would want the current so-called Proposal No. 48 to be in effect, because I would not want to be in a position of declaring a person a nonqualifier who happens to be the valedictorian in a very good high school taking a good set of courses. That is remote, but the possibility does exist.

Proposal No. 16 does not diminish the quality factor of the student. Educators know that students who do well in one component of education do well in the SAT, for example. This indicates that the student probably has skills, and maybe this student has attended a stronger high school and maybe elected stronger courses in the high school. If the student has high grades, it tells us this student probably has educational maturity, that this student has discipline, that this student has good study skills. All of these are good characteristics. So, when a test score drops down to a 650 and is compensated by a higher grade-

point average, this student is going to be just as strong as the student who had exactly a 700 and a 2.000.

I would suggest that we do as the Council has suggested, that we study this data very carefully. I think in the future, this Association should very well look at the possibility of maintaining and even expanding the flexible nature for this indexing. Then I think we are going to get at some of the issues and solve some of the issues that were brought up as we discussed in the previous two proposals. I feel the current rule, the 700 and the 2.000, is a very efficient way to do the wrong thing. That is about the only good thing I can say about it. I think we must have the flexibility here so I certainly urge your support of this proposal.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Tech University): Just as a point of information, should this legislation pass would the old Proposal No. 48-B stay in place?

Vice-President Roaden: The answer is yes.

William Friday (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I would like to ask Mr. Heyman or Mr. Bailey what their thinking was that prompted the dropping or a lowering of the 2.000 to a 1.800. Having all that has been said here about test scores, why are we lowering the 2.000 to this 1.800?

Mr. Heyman: I would say it was really the philosophy of the indexing system that was eloquently attested to by the prior two speakers. The notion was, in at least this beginning period, the first two years or the first three years, that we should be taking actions to bolster SAT and ACT scores as we would relate to the academic core curriculum. We feel seriously about trying to minimally punish those who come below it as this becomes a reality. The same with the GPA. I think we ought to note that the grade-point average is in 11 academic core subjects. We have never had that kind of a requirement before.

[Proposal No. 16 (page A-9) was approved (207-94, four abstentions).]

Graduate Assistant Coaches

Otto Breitenbach (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 89 would in effect put a limit on the number of graduate assistant coaches of five in football and two in basketball. There is no question that the graduate assistant's position has been very helpful and an excellent way for young people to become exposed to coaching and have a chance to move into full-time positions. However, I think it is proper to suggest that if we overload the market it does not perform any service for the young people that are in those positions if we just play numbers games trying to keep up with each other. The limit would eliminate that and permit everybody to function with a similar number.

[Proposal No. 89 (page A-60) was approved.]

[Proposal Nos. 100 and 102 were withdrawn.]

Ice Hockey Playing Seasons

Otto Breitenbach (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

A year ago the ice hockey playing schools put before you limitations on the

ice hockey seasons. Those limitations eliminated one traditional game that is held in Minnesota each year by the National Hockey Hall of Fame. That group and the WCHA would like to request the delegates to vote that game back in, outside of our regular limitation as identified in the proposition. I would urge the delegates to support this consistent with other sports that have similar all-star contests.

John W. Ryan (Indiana University, Bloomington): I rise at the instruction of the Presidents Commission not to speak for or against this proposal. I would be pleased if no one take what I am about to say as either in support or against this proposal, but rather to bring before the attention of all the delegates the sense of the Presidents Commission that within its proposals in the Convention Program are a number of proposals that deserve your attention from the standpoint of the results of the survey of the presidents, which indicated that the presidents of member institutions placed among the highest items of their interest the need to restrain, indeed to not permit increasing, playing seasons and numbers of contests.

Secondly, this Convention itself, the delegates of this Association at the special Convention in June of last year, adopted a resolution urging that we not increase playing time or playing seasons. In fact, it authorized the Council and the Presidents Commission to study the matter of intrusion on class time of student-athletes for the current seasons under which we operate.

[Proposal No. 104 (page A-69) was approved.]

[The Division I Business Session adjourned at 5:15 p.m.]

DIVISION II BUSINESS SESSION

Monday Morning, January 13, 1986

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. by Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University, chair.

[Note: The reporter was not present at the beginning of the business session. The following begins with discussion in progress.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules, Bylaws, Others

Mr. Sponberg: I think it's appropriate we begin to review the legislation, and we will be calling on members of the Division II Steering Committee. First, Louise Albrecht, will cover Proposals Nos. 1 through 13.

Louise Albrecht (Southern Connecticut State University): Proposals Nos. 1 through 13 are a consent package, one and two to be voted on together and three through 13 as one vote. These are housekeeping in nature and noncontroversial, and what they do is to bring up to date the constitution and the bylaws on legislation that had been passed at the previous Convention.

I am going to go through these briefly because they are noncontroversial. In case you have any questions, we can clear them up now.

No. 1 essentially takes the vice-presidents of each division as being a new majorial representative for the executive committee. Proposal No. 2 is what we are doing right now, only we are a little behind, in that the round tables now become business sessions. These two will be voted on in one vote.

In the consent package for the bylaws, No. 3 is a Division I proposal. Proposal No. 4 is for all sports other than football to have conference play-offs not count as the maximum limitation in that sport. No. 5 is for contests or dates of competition in championships with NAIA not to count toward the maximum, and No. 6 is a Division I proposal. No. 7 is essentially a Division III desire in that they do not want to award athletic aid in the first semester in residence to a transfer student from a Division III school. No. 8 would establish minimum numbers of participants for women's fencing.

Proposal No. 9 would abolish the Governmental Affairs Committee. No. 10 would increase the membership of the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, and No. 11 would increase the membership on the Research Committee. Proposal No. 12 would have at least one Men's Gymnastics Committee member come from each of the four men's gymnastics regions. No. 13 would affirm that national championships do not count in the minimum sport requirement, essentially having to do with those championships that are not held in each division.

Academics

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Proposal Nos. 14 through 18 on your agenda are all Division I issues; but because of the concern in Division II with academic standards and where we go from here, we thought it perhaps well to briefly review them. I will begin with Proposal No. 16, which is a revision of Bylaw 5-1-(j) as it was amended by Proposal No. 48 some few years ago. That proposal, as you will recall, set minimum ACT or SAT scores for initial eligibility in Division I. It was, while it passed by a large vote, was a very controversial measure; and there was great concern about its impact,

particularly upon disadvantaged students. As a consequence, over the last two years, the Council, through its Special Committee on Academic Standards, and the Presidents Commission have taken a hard look at 5-1-(j) as amended by Proposal No. 48.

The Association commissioned a survey by a professional group to evaluate its impact. That took the better part of one year; and then the committee, over the past 14 or 15 months, has labored to devise amendments. What No. 16 does in soften the impact of 5-1-(j) by providing an index that would phase in the requirements for initial eligibility over the next three years. Now, it is important to understand that if No. 16 does not pass in Division I, the present bylaw, which is the 15 on ACT and 700 on SAT, will take effect in the fall of 1986.

Proposal Nos. 14 and 15 are sponsored by a group of institutions that are opposed to the use of the ACT or SAT scores for determining initial eligibility. Proposal No. 14 would simply eliminate the SAT or ACT minimum requirement. No. 15 would essentially do the same thing but does not contemplate the use of ACT and SAT minimum for placement purposes.

All of this bears on Division II only to the extent that there is widespread concern in Division II, at least those of us on the Council keep hearing this, and I think this is true of the Presidents Commission, that Division II should move to establish some academic standards. I think all of us have felt that it would be a mistake for us to act until the situation in Division I is clarified. There was no point in our stepping voluntarily into the middle of an already existing controversy. I do not really know what the vote will be. I am inclined to think that probably Division I will approve No. 16 and defeat Nos. 14 and 15, but that is purely speculation.

Nevertheless, once the situation is clarified following this Convention, it is the intent of the Division II Steering Committee of the Council to turn its attention to the investment of some academic standards for Division II, although we don't feel necessarily committed to following the approach used in Division I. Some of us would prefer, for example, a more positive approach rather than one that establishes an absolute minimum cutoff. But we did want you to know that we are aware of your concerns and will move on it and bring you up to date on the issues.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Proposal Nos. 19, 20 and 21 have been grouped together by the Presidents Commission to allow for an early vote at the Convention. Proposal No. 19 is an outgrowth of a resolution passed overwhelming at the June special Convention, and that resolution grew out of a concern by schools and institutions that student-athletes in some instances are guilty and culpable in violations of NCAA rules and regulations. There also was a concern that the NCAA Eligibility Committee all too often reinstated athletes when there was a violation of NCAA regulations. Proposal No. 19 basically uses the exact language that was in the resolution that passed at the special Convention. It says that a student-athlete is basically culpable in a violation and that the Eligibility Committee, which can restore the eligibility, should look at those circumstances and only restore eligibility where circumstances warrant some restoration. You will also note that you have received today as an amendment by the Pacific-10 Conference, which would strike out the last sentence that refers to an athlete's culpability in major violations.

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I was wondering about a person who might be involved innocently, a situation with some high school student who was not aware of the rules. I am not talking about major cases where kids buy cars or things like that, but where they are involved innocently. Is he out forever now?

Mr. Burse: I think what it does is call to the attention of the Eligibility Committee the need in situations like that to look very closely at those facts and circumstances, to come to an understanding that if that student was innocently involved, they would have the right to restore that student's eligibility. What would happen is in those situations where, say, there is a major violation, if the Eligibility Committee reinstates a student-athlete's eligibility, there must be clearly stated reason why that eligibility was reinstated.

Mr. Niland: One of the major considerations in the involvement of a player is in getting cooperation, to have the player be helpful to the NCAA investigatory staff and Committee on Infractions in some way, to be able to encourage the student-athlete to tell the truth. How does this effect the fact that the player was involved or knows of an involvement or even innocently was involved? Is there any leniency for cooperation?

Mr. Burse: One of the things I discussed yesterday, I guess in the Council meeting, was whether cooperation in infraction cases would lead to some leniency by the Eligibility Committee. I do not think, as far as the Council is concerned at this particular point in time, that any decision has been made on that particular item. There is a resolution, I think it is No. 21, that talks about enforcement and compliance. Over the next year, more time and attention will be given to looking in some detail at the enforcement program, the whole enforcement area, to try to come out with better procedures to be followed.

Mr. Niland: The way I read this, I agree with that. The way I read this, No. 19 probably would not allow No. 21 as a resolution to really work its way into that. I think it is very important to get people to cooperate, admit that they broke some rules in some minor ways and asking for cooperation so that investigation can continue in a rather orderly manner.

Mr. Burse: I guess with No. 19 as it presently is written, the Council does not see a concern that it will prevent the Eligibility Committee from doing what it presently is doing. What it does more than anything is request that in those cases where the Eligibility Committee does make an exception that there be a stated reason for it.

Mr. Niland: I feel quite uncomfortable with that.

Elwood N. Shields (Northeast-Eight Conference): Would the chair kindly give a rationale for the Pacific-10 amending No. 19 by eliminating the last sentence, please?

Mr. Burse: Well, let me tell you I cannot speak for the Pacific-10. My guess is that there are two reasons. One, they may find the last sentence is superfluous given the language that proceeds it. That could be one reason. The second one could be that they would not want such strong language regarding major violations in the regulation at this particular point in time. All I can do is speculate.

The next proposal is No. 20, which again grows out of a resolution passed at the June special Convention. In particular, there was a concern expressed about how basketball seasons were being lengthened, that there was a need to draw back and draw some very clear lines on that. At the 1985 Convention, games played in Alaska and Hawaii were exempted from counting as one of

the games of competition. With this proposal, you can only participate in one per year without counting it. It is another measure to bring some limits back to the number of games of competition. Again on No. 20, the Pacific-10 has proposed to amend that by stating that if you play a game against a foreign team in the United States, that would not count, and then a second amendment to it in which they strike out the one foreign tour in any given academic year.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): I think teams that come to the Great Alaska Shootout and go to Hawaii and continue on and play 36 and 37 games are a problem, and we do not have a problem with that. The problem we have is that during a season, if a team comes to play us or the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, it will be competing in four games in basketball, either the men or women. We have a tough time getting games sometimes. We do pay the people's way up; and it is my understanding that if a team came to play us, played four games, only one of those would be allowed over and above the 27 or 28. So they would have to count three of those. We think that is extremely unfair. Most teams only come once every three or four years, and they should be able to count those games in addition to their normal 27 or 28 games, depending upon their league.

And secondly, we do not understand why the out-of-season foreign tour is thrown into this. I guess the amendment might speak to that. If a team comes up to Alaska during the year, what difference would it make if they take a summer foreign tour and play in Alaska or Hawaii during that same year. That does not seem to fit, as far as we are concerned. It says here one game, or if you are in a tournament, it is a maximum of four. I do not know of any tournament that has four games, at least at this point. So we have some problems with this as presented, not necessarily with the intent of it, but how it is presented. I would urge for a defeat of this at this time.

Mr. Burse: Proposal No. 21 is a resolution, and it's an outgrowth of the resolution introduced at the special Convention by the University of Texas that was referred to the Council and the Presidents Commission. That resolution expressed some concern about the way the NCAA was handling enforcement actions and handling infraction cases. There was some concern that there was not proper due process being provided in those particular hearings and transactions. What No. 21 does is state that the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission would continue to study for another year the procedures that are currently in place regarding the Infractions Committee and that the Infractions Committee study its own procedures over the course of the next year. At the 1987 Convention, we would come back with proposals or changes in those procedures, hopefully to address the concerns by those member institutions that are somewhat concerned about the particular amendments that were passed at the special Convention regarding the enforcement actions.

Financial Aid

Judith M. Brame (California State University, Northridge): The financial aid proposals are Proposals No. 22 through 29. On No. 22, there will be a motion to refer that particular proposal back to the Presidents Commission and the Council. While the intent was to have a standard value that applied Association wide, as it was written, it did not provide for a legitimate cap. So it will be referred. Proposals Nos. 23 and 24 both relate to the Pell Grants. No. 23, if passed, would exempt the full Pell award from the financial aid limitation, rather than the \$900 exemption that we currently have. If No. 23 passes, then No. 24 is moot. If we defeat No. 23, then No. 24 would provide for

an increase in the current exemption from \$900 to \$1,400.

Proposal No. 25 can be considered to be permissive in nature. Adoption of this legislation would permit institutions to continue financial aid awards beyond the current limitation of five and six years as long as the student-athlete remained an undergraduate. Passage of Proposal No. 26 would permit financial aid to be awarded to incoming student-athletes during the summer time prior to the student's freshman year.

Proposal No. 27 would modify the restrictions on the established financial aid award specified in Constitution 3-4-(a)-(4) by limiting it to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses instead of the current \$1,000 that now exists and also permitting it for an unlimited term rather than one academic year. Adoption of Proposal No. 28, as long as the award is disbursed through a member institution, would permit the student-athlete to receive an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement in high school without the award being included in the maximum aid computation.

And the last proposal, Proposal No. 29, permits athletes in the equivalency sports to work for any department in the university other than athletics, physical education and recreation without the compensation for that employment counting toward the aid limits for those sports. Currently any work counts.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I am speaking not as a member of the Council but for Livingston. I have strongly supported the proposal to take financial aid out of the constitution and put it in the bylaws so that the divisions can act separately. And I have done that because, as a constitutional provision, it requires a two-thirds vote to change it. Division I has, in recent years, developed considerable interest in increasing its financial aid limits in the hope that doing so may reduce the problems that are more prevalent than we like in that division with under-the-counter payments and this sort of thing. I am not sure it will solve it, but it's worth a try. I support taking financial aid legislation out of the constitution. The motion to refer will become one of technical concern and not substantive concern. My guess is it will be back on the agenda next year with some slight modification.

In the interim, Division II is confronted by proposals by Division I institutions that would increase the exemption of the Pell Grant and would cost much, apart from any philosophical questions regarding it. I want to call that to the attention of the delegates, because I think there is a stronger sentiment in Division I this time to pass those limits than there have been in the past years. Now we increased the exemption from \$400 to \$900 three years ago. Now the proposal is to increase it another \$500 to \$1,400, and one proposal would exempt the Pell Grant totally. So if those of you in Division II who are opposed to increasing those limits want to make sure it does not happen, it is important you be present and vote against it.

General

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): The general issues or general proposals are from No. 30 to No. 39. Perhaps, let me start off by saying in terms of Proposal No. 30 the one thing that perhaps will not be discussed tonight at the General Round Table is the cost factor, which may be of some concern to some of you. The monies for that drug testing portion for Division II will come out of the general fund and will not be a part of the block-grant funding for championships. So that may be of some interest to you.

Proposal No. 31 is basically a resolution recommending strengthening

federal legislation regarding gambling on intercollegiate athletic contests. Proposal Nos. 32, 33 and 34 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 35 extends the language to the legislation that currently is in place and basically is permissive in that it allows or provides for the ability to apply Section 10 of the enforcement procedure to those institutions that may gain an unfair advantage by merely getting a temporary restraining order and then allowing that student to play and then the student does not then have to provide any kind of rationale for why that legislation was set aside or why the rules were set aside. So it is permissive in nature.

Proposal No. 36 is about legislative proposal cost estimates. This again, basically, is a proposal to require documentation of costs by the sponsors of legislation that would create significant expenditures. I think in the past we defined significant expenditures as being five thousand dollars. So the figure would be included in the Convention Program so that the membership will have the ability to see what the various costs of these proposals will be.

Proposal No. 37 is the elimination of the indoor track and field championships for Divisions I and III. Proposal No. 38 basically gives flexibility to the committee that will be responsible for administering the 1986-87 block-grant funding program so that consideration may be given to those championships that we have this year but are fairly close to being at the number where we would have to drop that championship. No. 39 is basically a recommendation that in the postseason football contests, participating institutions would reduce the cost of promotional time from a 150-second to a 120-second spot.

Mr. Sponberg: President Cleary, did the Presidents Commission take a position on Proposal No. 30?

James W. Cleary (California State University, Northridge): At the last session of the Presidents Commission, on the recommendation of the Division II committee, the Commission voted to endorse Proposal No. 30 and to convey that endorsement to the business meeting Tuesday or at an appropriate time.

Recruiting

Bob Moornean (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): First, we have No. 40, which is on recruiting contacts. Actually the intent is to prevent any recruiting contact by representatives of athletics interests, which actually means booster clubs, on campus or off campus, limiting involvement in recruiting to institutional staff members. We are trying to get the boosters out of the business. Proposal No. 41 would limit noncontact off-campus talent assessment to six regular-season observations per member institution of a prospect's team, excluding attendance at postseason events in which a team may participate.

Thomas J. Niland (Le Moyne College): I want to talk about No. 40 for just a second. As you know, a few years ago we did try to remove the boosters from the recruiting process by having them not make contact off campus; and I think it's been very effective. I think it is a step in the right direction. Many times coaches and school people were taking the boosters to the kids' houses, meeting them at their high schools and the contacts were made there for some illegal activities.

But in reading No. 40, it goes quite far beyond that, particularly in its effect on Division II schools. Some colleges have the contact and have the big reception and the party after the football and basketball games and contacts are made there. At Division II, at least at my institute and at several others that we compete against, it is almost impossible to eliminate your former athletes,

players, friends of the college, alumni, that come to some of your home football, basketball, baseball games. They might come in contact with a prospective student-athlete who is visiting the campus. It is somewhat of a liquor-prohibition rule. You cannot just stop that. There is going to be contact in the lobby. But this would eliminate all possibility of me being in the lobby and introducing a former player who is a judge, an attorney, an accountant, at a basketball game to a kid who might be thinking of coming there that's visiting the campus. I would like to introduce that man. He is an alumnus who we are quite proud of. But I can not do that.

Mr. Moorman: Well, I do not think that has been our problem. You are talking to the wrong man if you want me to defend it.

Mr. Niland: I am not asking to defend it. I am trying to bring it to the attention of the committee, of the members of Division II that this is going to inhibit us from the honesty and the real recruiting, which we have used these people for. It might be possible in Division I that they need that. I do not think we need it, and I do not think we should pass it.

Mr. Moorman: I think you might observe where the source is. That might answer some of your questions.

Mr. Niland: Then I would like to feel that I brought it to the attention of the committee or the body here, and I hope they will see their wisdom in seeing it does not prevail for Division II. Thank you.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): I assume this has to do with basketball. How do you determine in recruiting, who that particular scout is going to see? If you have a lot of high schools in your area and you are only allowed to evaluate an athlete six times, you can just go to say you are scouting someone else. Who is going to determine what player you are scouting, and then who keeps track of it?

Mr. Moorman: No. 42 would prohibit the issuance of institutional or conference financial aid agreements prior to the letter of intent. This, of course, comes from the Southwest Athletic Conference, but I think it is basically from Fred Jacoby who is in charge of our letter of intent. I think this is an outgrowth of the fact that we were not supposed to have conference or institutional letters of intent prior to the regular national letter of intent. Proposal No. 43 would permit each Divisions I-A or I-AA member to visit a football prospect's educational institution only once each week for recruiting contact purposes. Of course, this does not affect us in action, but it affects us in what they want to do. Now we have an amendment for that, as you probably noted, that comes from the Division I steering committee, 43-1. I'll read it because evidently most of you have not read it. "In football only, one additional in-person, off-campus contact per prospect shall be permitted during each week of the appropriate contact period by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative. However, a member institution may visit a prospect's educational institution on no more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of recruited prospects enrolled at the same institution." In other words, if you have 10 prospects, you will see them one time. You do not go in there several different times.

No. 44 would prohibit Division I member institutions from providing official visits for and making in-person recruiting contacts with a 2.000 nonqualifier in the first year of junior college enrollment. In other words, if I

am from Division I institution and I enroll a kid into junior college, I am not supposed to go and check and find out how he is doing.

Proposal No. 45 is a resolution on recruiting contact limits. Basically what it is trying to do is to solidify and get a better grouping or a better rule as to recruiting regulations, and this might not be such a bad idea.

No. 46 is our tryout rule. This is to limit the application of the tryout rule to those individuals who have begun classes for the ninth grade or who have attained their 15th birthday. This is to clarify the exceptions of the tryout rule and to provide a definition of open competition involving prospects that can be approved by the NCAA Council.

No. 47 would incorporate the current requirements of Bylaws 1-6-(e) and 1-10 and Case No. 419, concerning camps and clinics, into a new Bylaw 1-7.

Printed recruiting aids, No. 48 would specify in the bylaws those printed materials that may be distributed to prospective student-athletes by the athletics departments of a member institution. No. 49, transportation to campus, would permit an institution to transport a new student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or airport nearest the campus only at the time of the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes. I might also add it means that if a kid has an emergency and needs to catch an airplane right away, you cannot take him or her home or to the airport.

No. 50, self-financed visits and transportation, would permit an institutional staff member to accompany a prospect who is on a self-financed visit and provide transportation for the purpose of viewing practice and/or competitive facilities that are located off the institution's main campus but within the 30-mile area surrounding the campus. So if you are practicing in an area that is a little distance away, you are permitted to take him over there if he pays his way to get to your facility.

No. 51 would prohibit all individuals on coaching staffs or at member institutions from participating in coaching activities involving summer AAU basketball teams. No. 52, recruiting-complimentary admissions, would specify that an institution's intercollegiate team must compete in a campus athletics event in order for the institution to provide complimentary admissions to a prospect visiting the institution's campus at his or her own expense. No. 53, recruiting-publicity, to allow an NCAA institution's staff member to be interviewed as a pregame, half time or postgame guest during the broadcast of a high school or junior college contest. No. 54, men's ice hockey recruiting, would prohibit any in-person, on- or off-campus recruiting in the sport of ice hockey by a member of the Division I coaching staff during the Division I men's ice hockey championship. This is only to do exactly what we are already doing in basketball and football, but of course that would not affect us.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I wanted to call attention to a problem with Proposal 41. There is a concern that 41, in terms of the section of the bylaws with which it deals, might limit the visits to six and not six per sport, so that conceivably, as written, if your basketball coach made six visits or your football coach made six visits, the football coach could not make any if the basketball coach made six. The Council had referred this back to the sponsors to make an amendment to specify six per sport. Now there simply may be a communication problem.

Conceivably the Council could deal with it by an interpretation. I personally support the intent of the legislation; but I think it is flawed, and I think the cleanest way would be simply to defeat it and bring it back next year with a

more careful draft. So I would urge us to vote no on 41.

Membership and Classification

Joan Board (Grand Valley State College): Proposal No. 55, four-sport sponsorship requirement, will give the Council the authority to grant waivers of the four-sport sponsorship requirement under certain circumstances such as female/male enrollment ratio, something of that manner. Proposal No. 56, is the proposal that will eliminate both indoor and outdoor track to count as two sports, allowing you to have just track counting as one sport for your sports sponsorship. Proposal Nos. 57, 58, 59 and 60 are all Division I proposals. Proposal No. 61, is the Division II criteria proposal. This is one of the proposals that we will be voting on in this business session. This proposal will permit one of the two team sports that are required for membership in Division II to be classified in Division I. Proposals No. 62 and 63 are both Division III proposals. Proposal No. 64, is a change of division membership proposal. This will establish a three-year waiting period from the time an institution changes its membership to become effective before it can become eligible to participate in the championships of that division. This has been amended. The date from immediately has changed until September 15th, 1986, so that gives you some time to make some adjustments.

Proposal No. 65 has to deal with championships eligibility. This specifies that a team that competes in a championship in a division other than its membership division will observe the limitations of the number of contests and dates of competitions in that division. Proposal No. 66, multidivision classification, will permit a Division II member to petition to be classified in Division III in a sport if there is no Division II championship in that particular sport. Proposal No. 67 also deals with multidivision classification. This will permit Divisions I and II institutions that have instituted or reinstated or reclassified their football programs in Division III to compete for the Division III championship after the allotted time period has passed.

Chris Rinne (University of California, Riverside): I would like to speak to Proposal 64. I would like to point out to Division II, this body, that 64 would, in fact, provide for a five-year waiting period for any member of Division II that wished to move to Division I in that you would have to comply for two years with Division I eligibility standards before you could make that change effective and then three more years before you would be eligible for a championship. So this, in fact, cuts down the mobility of member institutions within divisions of the NCAA, and I cannot understand why this would be an advantage for Division II institutions.

Ladell Payne (Randolph-Macon College): Can you clarify what is happening on 64 with the change of date to September? Does that mean that if a change takes place prior to September 1, the intention is made or whatever, that from that point, that you are not bound by the three-year rule?

Ms. Board: Yes. Institutions that are changing divisions before that time would not have to wait that time.

Charles A. Eberle (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I would like to point out in 65 that the really important part of this is for institutions in divisions where there is no championship in that division, and that is Division II. There are several sports that have no championships in Division II, and we must go to either Division I or Division III for championship opportunities. Right now the Division II playing limits are lower than either of the other two divisions because Division I is higher and Division III has none, so this

becomes increasingly important for Division II members from that perspective.

No. 66 would address the issue for Division II institutions that move to Division III but it would not address it for institutions that would move to Division I. It would permit a reclassification. However, philosophically, Division II should not have to reclassify in order to have the same things; you are competing against Division I.

Eligibility

James R. Spalding (Bellarmine College): Proposal 68 is being politicized quite a lot. First, it has created a number of newspaper headlines. What it does is simply extend the four-year eligibility rule into a five-year eligibility rule. The president of Boise State and the commissioner of the Sky Line Conference sent out materials well ahead of this Convention talking to the merits of this proposal. They see it as a very practical measure for Division I.

In the Proposal No. 69, we are talking about trying to place into order the aspects of indoor and outdoor track, as we have done in some other legislations, into only one season of competition. In No. 70, we are back to the one-time exception rule that Division I disliked considerably last year. And Proposal 71, modifies the current legislation so that it takes out related athletics aid from any aspects to the Article 5, Section l-(m)-(14). There is an amendment coming from the ECAC, however, that not only would put that aid back into the legislation but also increases the verbage so it brings into better compliance the interpretation. At least it brings the language to the proposal that is more in line with the interpretation that is being used for that section of the bylaw.

Proposal No. 72 is simply to add women's basketball to the other programs of football and men's basketball, and Proposal 73 would want to also add ice hockey; so that if all of them were passed, we would have men's basketball, women's basketball, football and ice hockey. Proposal 74 adds more language to the current legislation so that a transfer student would not be able to transfer from an institution early in the semester, transfer to another institution and use that same term as part of filling the residency requirement. This would make that impossible if it was after the 12th day of classes of the semester. I assume that anything prior to that would still allow the potential of a transfer using the same term from one institution to another.

Proposal 75 is an effort to bring in line the waiver exception for junior college as we have it for the four-year institutions except that it adds the same language pertinent to Division I for the 2.000 nonqualifier. Proposal 76, eligibility on practice, probably should have been put into the consent package. I believe it was meant to be and inadvertently maybe was left out. All it was doing is bringing into the language the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1, which differentiates to some extent the five-year rule for Division I versus Divisions II and III.

In the Proposal No. 77, the five-year rule is an allowance for an appeal to the current five-year rule for which there is now no appeal. The Council, or the subcommittee designated by it, would be able to vote as to whether there is an appropriate reason for an exception to the five year in Division II and the 10-semester or 15-quarter rule.

Proposal No. 78 is a Division I matter. Proposal No. 79 is a Division III concern.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division II Business Session agenda was adjusted at this point to hear the petitions for waivers of Bylaw 10-1-(g), the Division II membership criteria, from University of Alabama, Huntsville; Chaminade University; Franklin Pierce College; Paine College; Southwest Baptist University; West Texas State University, and University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. All of the petitions for waivers were granted. The business sessions returned to the review of legislation.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Playing and Practice Seasons

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): Proposal Nos. 91 and 104 deal with playing and practice seasons. If you glanced at those, you notice that many of those are Division I proposals. Last year, we spent a lot of time on this particular section in establishing the maximum limitations; and the fact that few of these do, indeed, pertain to Division II indicates to me that possibly we are satisfied with most of the limitations that have been placed upon us in Division II.

Looking at Proposal 91, there are parts of that that do pertain to us. This would define traditional seasons as fall, winter, spring and identify those sports that are traditionally associated with certain times of the year. Parts E and F would be Division I portions that would restrict their schedules and bring their limitations down to their competitive opportunities, which would be less than what we have in Division II in some sports. For that reason in Division I, I doubt if they have a very good chance of passing. Part G deals with soccer, which would more or less expand the activity in that particular sport.

Proposal Number 92, if passed, would exclude from counting in the current limitation fund raising events that would involve student-athletes and alumni and friends of their respective institutions as long as, during these particular activities as listed here, the student-athlete would not miss any classes. Some of these things go on now. For example, alumni golf tournaments are fund raisers. They have been counted in the maximum number. This proposal, if passed, would exclude these from counting, as long as the student does not miss any classes.

Proposal Number 93 would move up the starting date for fall sports to the preceding weekend if September 1, which now is the starting date for fall sports, falls on a Sunday or a Monday. So in fact, that would only move the seasons up a day or two and not require you to wait until the following weekend, if that was going to be your first day of competition.

You recall that last year limitations were put in place at the Convention to exclude from counting the NCAA championship and one conference tournament in a particular sport as long as that conference tournament was conducted at the conclusion of the season. During the past year, we have found this to be a little bit of a problem, especially in some spring sports where some institutions' calendars vary so drastically that in order to have a conference championship, some teams had to compete when classes were already out or during examination period or very early in the season. And obviously if you conducted your conference championship in the middle of the year and then came back and kept playing, the conference championship had to count in your limitations because it was not at the end of the season. So Proposal No. 94 if passed, would enable you to play your conference championship really

any time during the season, as long as it is your conference championship or the particular tournament that qualifies your team for the NCAA. So you could play at any time, it still would not count if this passes.

No. 95 is primarily a PSAC proposal. The conference has an East/West play-off game in football; but because, obviously at the beginning of the season nobody knows who is going to be playing in that championship game, none of those schools can schedule more than 10 games because obviously two of the 14 are going to be selected to play for the championship. If they played, 11 games, the extra game would be 12, which would be one too many.

For Nos. 96, 97 and 98, I will just speak of those in general terms. Last June, in response to the concern of the membership and the concern of the Presidents Commission regarding the demands placed upon student-athletes regarding missed classes, various playing-season limitations were placed on all sports. This concern also was addressed last June at our special Convention, and we overwhelming passed a resolution that was sponsored by the Presidents Commission that we would have a one-year moratorium on any increases until such time as we see how these limitations are working. Proposal Nos. 96, 97 and 98, in one way or another, would expand the current competitive opportunities available to the various divisions and would be contrary to the general principles of regulations that we established last year and reaffirmed in June. And for that reason, the Council and the Division II Steering Committee has voted not to support any of those proposals.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak for a moment to explain 95 a little further. No. 95 influences two conferences in this country. Both of those conferences are in Division II—the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Because of our conference numbers, fourteen schools, we divide ourselves into two sections, play a round-robin schedule and then play a championship game. Because of the size of our conference, we are able to do that. We like it. It is excellent. The competition is very keen.

However, one of the problems is the current legislation limits the institutions to only 10 scheduled contests where the rest of the world out there has 11 contests. So passing 95 would permit us merely to play 11 contests. Now, to sanction our championship game, we will now be required to propose to the Postseason Football Committee our 12th game, our championship game. Now the 12th game caused a little anxiety to some people, and I would just like to point out something, that 12 football games is not unique and we do not view this as proliferating the football season.

This past year with the bowl games for Division I-AA, qualifying the Division I-A bowl games, 68 institutions played 12 games. The fact is, 20 institutions played 30 games. Eight played 14 and four institutions actually played 15 football games this year. So, we do not view this as a proliferation to get one more game for our two conferences, only two conferences in the country.

This legislation would permit 80 percent of our conference to play 11 games, when now it is only allowed to play 10. We think that is unfair, so No. 95 gives our two conferences some relief and it still requires us to go to the Postseason Football Committee to sanction the 12th game.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): I would like to speak to Proposal No. 96. I realize that skiing is not a concern to the majority here. The coed championship does create one of the most exciting and unique

opportunities in collegiate sports. Over 95 percent of the top-ranked U.S. skiers last year were members of the NCAA skiing teams. We need your help to eliminate the problem that was caused by the limitations. Ski meets are coed, consisting of men's and women's events, four events. This format necessitates two days for completion. Under the current interpretation of limits, an athlete, male or female, must individually count each day of a single meet. It is now comparable to a college basketball season of 14 games or a football season of six games. It would be most difficult, if not impossible, to the current caliber of ski teams if they were restricted. I know there is a concern with missing classes, but most of the ski meets are in January. We send our team after Christmas and they are out 14 or 15 days, and they do not miss any classes. Now they are not able to compete in as many meets because of this unique interpretation.

Ralph McFillen (Gulf South Conference): On No. 95, I think I have a question of clarification. I have no problem with what is being proposed. I think for those two conferences that is fine. I guess the question I have is whether you would go before the NCAA Postseason Football Committee and get its approval. Is that right? Is that what I heard?

Mr. Elwell: Yes, that is the way we understand it, yes.

Mr. McFillen: Maybe I need a clarification. I do not believe you want to do that because the minimum criteria for a postseason football game is going to be prohibitive from your standpoint if you are talking about pay-offs and so forth. I do not see the legislation is saying anything about you having to go get approval. I think the legislation simply says that any conference could do this whether it is your two conferences or my conference. If we elected to play a conference championship game, it would be permissible under this legislature. Am I incorrect in my interpretation of this?

Mr. Elwell: You could play a college championship game as long as you did not exceed 11 games.

Mr. McFillen: This legislation allows us to have 11 games plus two of the teams would meet for a championship, which would give them a 12th game. Is that my understanding of this legislation?

Mr. Elwell: No, you do not get automatically a 12th game. If you pass this legislation, only those teams who were to compete in the championship. It would not allow the rest to play 12, obviously.

Mr. McFillen: That is true, but you could have two teams, any two teams in a conference to play a 12th game.

Mr. Spalding: No, I think it says championship, does it not?

Mr. McFillen: Well, championship game between those two, I do not think you can take a first-place and fifth-place team and have them play a championship game. If you had two teams tie in the regular season, does this legislation preclude those two teams playing again for a championship game? That's my question, I guess.

Mr. Elwell: Currently if they tie they cannot play in this particular game, and this proposal would not allow them to play.

Steven R. Morgan (NCAA staff): This legislation by itself does not give anybody a 12th game. The problem is that if the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference or any other conference is going to seek to go beyond the 11 and play a 12th, it is going to have to get permission from somewhere to do that, either through the Postseason Football Committee, which, correctly raises some significant hurdles or coming back to the Convention a year from now

with legislation to try to restrict significantly to whom that 12th game opportunity is available. Until now, all the schools in the conference that have wanted to play a championship game of this type have had to schedule only 10 games, and the two championship teams are the only ones that can play the 12th game. The other schools are left then with having played a 10-game schedule. What this would do is let everybody in the conference play 11, but it does not get you the 12th game all by itself.

Mr. McFillen: I am not speaking against it. I support these two large conferences, and they certainly maybe need a waiver. But I am not sure that it is not going to open the door for other conferences that maybe do not have that problem of 14 members or however many you may have to do that. I think it is going to open doors for problems down the road.

It does not yet, but obviously that potential, I guess, could exist.

William M. Leete Jr. (University of New Haven): I would like to speak for Proposal 95 due to Northeast scheduling problems in Division II. Currently, there are only five Division II schools in New England that play Division II football. The only schools that we can compete against from Division II are in the Pennsylvania State Conference; and right now when they only play 10 games, it causes us some degree of problems with scheduling. We would certainly like them to play 11 so they could play more of us in New England.

Mr. Elwell: We will skip Proposal Nos. 100 and 101 for the moment because they were somewhat related and skip to Nos. 102, 103, 104, which are Division I proposals. We will not vote on them, but they increase competitive opportunities or lengthen the season in Division I. They will be opposed by the Division I people in their business session and also on the Convention floor.

Proposal No. 100 is a Division I proposal that would reduce baseball and softball to 60 games and specify that those games must be played only in the spring. In a manner, these changes would be more limiting than the current Division II limitations in those sports, given the fact that we can play in the fall.

There may be some sentiment for No. 101, and I am sure we will hear that before we leave this particular proposal. At last year's Convention, the baseball people amended the baseball limitations to include the fall games, which, in fact, gave 20 additional games. The Division II people thought that they were included in that amendment, but indeed they were not; and by the time the proposal or the amendment got to the Convention floor, it was discovered that Division II was not included in that particular amendment. It was too late to do anything about it, so what happened was Division I ended up with the 20 additional games, primarily in the fall season. I am certain the proponents of the California Collegiate Athletic Association are here, and I know there is a representative of the Baseball Coaches Association here. I am certain that they will speak to the relative merits of this particular proposal.

[*The Division II Business Session was recessed at 11 a.m.*]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1986

The session was called to order at 2:45 p.m., with Mr. Sponberg presiding.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Sponberg: At this time, we will resume our review of the legislation.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I rise not to speak either in support or opposition of Proposal No. 101 but to give the background of it. Last year, this Convention considered a major piece of legislation that limited the number of

contests in Division I and in Division II. At that time, the proposal from the Council called for a maximum of 60 baseball games in both Division I and in Division II. The baseball coaches who met last year at the time of the Convention wanted to amend the legislation for both Division I and Division II. The amendment was offered for Division I to increase from 60 to 80 and was approved. However, inadvertently, the amendment was not submitted before the deadline as it regarded Division II; and so there was no way to consider the amendment at last year's Convention. The Council voted on the basis of the original proposal, approving it and setting a limit of 60 baseball games for Division II.

Because of the mix-up last year, I made a commitment at that time to those who supported the 80-game limit to help them get the amendment up for consideration this year. Now I think it is also important to comment briefly on a point that was mentioned this morning. Division I will consider separately in its business session a proposal to reduce the limit from 80 to 60. They have not yet voted, so we will be voting without the knowledge of what Division I has done. After we have voted, should the limits—should this group vote to increase to 80 and should Division I go 60—we have made arrangements to move tomorrow to reconsider for the benefit of those who feel the limits ought to be the same in Divisions I and II. I hope this background is helpful, and there are a number of proponents here to argue the case.

Robert J. Hiegert (California State University, Northridge): Two members of this body were put on an ad hoc committee by the American Baseball Coaches Association to develop legislation that would conform with the amendment passed last year to put restrictions for traditional limitations on all the sports. We acted as a group. We put that legislation forward from the American Baseball Coaches Association, and somehow in route from our committee meeting to the where the amendments to amendments were processed, Division II was left off, inadvertently. I think it would have passed last year, at least it passed very handily in Division I. Since that time, our institution, as many of you did, voted in favor of upholding the presidents' wishes that there be a year moratorium immediately. I asked the NCAA what we could do.

We circulated a letter of statement to all the presidents in Division II concerning this problem, and we presented legislation to the special Convention in June. It was turned down because it was out of order, and we were told to rewrite the thing this year. What you have in front of you, is exactly what is on the book, in the NCAA Manual, for Division I baseball. I think if you have your Manual with you, it would be very helpful for all of you if you turned to page 65. The issue is not whether it is 60 or 80 games. That number is palatable to you or it is not palatable. The issue is this, that we have a 20 game difference in baseball in Division II from we have in Division I.

Since we are restricted on grants right now, we are not allowed to come up and grant the whole team like you are in a football or basketball situations. One of the only advantages to people that have to compete and recruit against Division I schools is the amount of games that you could schedule or offer to your program. This is a tremendous disadvantage for those institutions that are in that situation right now.

I am here as a past baseball coach and a person who sat at the baseball convention. The straw vote was unanimous in Division II that whatever the limitation was, it should be the same in Division II as it is in Division I. I think

you should know that the straw vote on No. 100 was unanimously against the vote. So that the 60-game limitation by the Big Ten is not going to go, and we will vote after that.

Ladell Payne (Randolph-Macon College): I am here to speak at least in part on behalf of action that was taken by the Presidents Commission yesterday. It was requested that at each of the meetings where it was appropriate for this that the group be reminded that last summer at the special Convention, a resolution was passed indicating a desire to limit the increase in the number of contests in all sports.

This action was approved last summer by a vote of 429 to three. The Presidents Commission felt that the current legislation proposed here is so obviously contrary in spirit and in intent of action of last summer that Division II should be discouraged from passing it.

Bradford W. Hovious (Delta State University): I do not know whether my president was one of those that voted for it or against it. We have played baseball up until this past year with an unlimited number of games, and we have not found that it greatly affected the academic achievements or budget that we had set aside for baseball during those years. We, as a member of Gulf South Conference and an institution that does compete against Division I schools, feel that this number of 80 is a much more equitable and fair figure for us.

We see it as being permissive. We see it as being a scheduling number, not an actual playing number as many of us experienced during the spring time. We also think that the number of double headers that are played during a schedule also tend to cut down on the actual class time missed. So even though it is 20 more games, we do not see it as being that much more school missed; and we are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. Elwell: Are there any other comments on 101? This is one of the two proposals that we will be voting on shortly.

Governance

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Proposal No. 80 through No. 86 relate to governance, which deals with the structure of the Association.

Proposal No. 80 officially designates the Division I members that are not I-A and I-AA as I-AAA. It gives them legislative autonomy in the bylaws for those matters upon which any division can vote separately or matters relating only to that division. I would point out I-AAA does not have football; and under the regulations that established the three segments of Division I, basketball matters must be voted upon by all members of the division. It does give Division I-AAA the right to have a summer legislative meeting separately from the Convention as can Division I-A. It does not affect Division II; but it is a common bylaw, and all three divisions must approve it in separate votes.

Proposal No. 81 was advanced by a group of institutions that would seek to require the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee to nominate at least two candidates for each vacant position and to require those committees to circulate requests for nominees to the membership and to mail copies of their proposed nominees in advance. With reference to the latter part of this amendment, I would point out that prior to the time the Committees on Committees meets to consider vacancies, there is published in The NCAA News a list of all the vacancies together with the requirements that apply to the division. For example, whether it must be a man or woman, whether it must be a particular area, represent a particular division

or geographic area, and members are invited to submit nominations. I am told by members of the Nominating Committee and by the Committees on Committees that they do get a significant number of suggestions from the membership.

The nomination of candidates for the various committee assignments is a fairly complex process because of the many requirements in the bylaws regarding geographic representation, representation of men, women, division representation and so forth. And for that reason, the Council is of the opinion that the present system is working satisfactorily. There are, as you know, limitations on the number of terms that any of us may serve in any of the various positions to assure rotation. We think the present system works well, and that this legislation is unneeded.

Proposal No. 82 is simply a proposal that would enable the institutions that are classified in Divisions II or III but play Division I ice hockey to vote on Division I ice hockey legislation. The theory is that they play by the same rules and they ought to have some part in determining what those rules are. In that regard, hockey is a somewhat unusual sport in that there is a relatively small number of institutions that compete in hockey and a great number do compete in Division I hockey that are not otherwise classified in Division I.

Proposal No. 83 is a Council proposal that establishes the number of institutions required to sponsor legislation. Under the present system, any group of six institutions may join together in sponsoring legislation. If a smaller number of institutions submit a proposal, it will be reviewed by the Council. This has generated a lot of demand upon the Council's time, which does not, in many instances, seem to be supported by broad interest among the membership. This proposal simply says that if a piece of legislation is not, in fact, sponsored by six members, it will not be reviewed and considered by the Council.

It is my understanding that Proposal No. 84 has been withdrawn.

Proposal No. 85 was also initiated by the Council and would eliminate representatives of high school or junior college interests as members of the NCAA sports committees.

Proposal No. 86 relates only to the Division I-AA Football Committee, although it must be voted on by all divisions in a divided vote and would increase the size of that committee by adding two at-large members with conference representation limited to one of those. There is apparently, from hearing some of the discussion about this, some basis for this as an effort to make the I-AA Football Committee a bit more representative.

Moving to Proposals Nos. 87 through 90, all of them deal with personnel matters—87 and 88 with the numbers of the football coaching staff, 89 with graduate assistant coaches and 90 with travel-squad limits.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): Proposal Nos. 105, 106 and 107 are Council-supported amendments by either the Professional Sports Liaison Committee or the Committee on National Drug Testing Policy. No. 105 allows institutions to expand a career counseling panel and permits the inclusion of one athletics department staff member on that panel. No. 106 allows institutions' career counseling panel to review the proposed professional sports contracts and allows them to meet with the student-athlete and the professional team's representative.

Both Nos. 107 and 108 modify Section 8, which addresses the permissible expenses that an institution may provide a student-athlete. No. 107, again,

sponsored by Council, adds to the list of permissible expenses that an institution may provide a student-athlete with drug rehabilitation expenses. And I think in the spirit of Proposal No. 30, that is in order. Proposal No. 108 adds to the list of permissible expenses that an institution may provide a student-athlete or on-campus student development and career counseling service.

Proposal No. 109 permits colleges and universities to pay expenses for student-athletes to participate in the official tryout for the national sports festival.

Proposal No. 110 modifies an interpretation of Case 41 that includes items such as socks, head bands, T-shirts, wrist bands, visors, hats, swim caps, towels and knee pads as a part of the official uniform that would permit the appearance of manufacturer's logo and trademarks. Presently, these items are excluded from the list and may not have any visible commercial identification.

Mr. Sponberg: The next item on your agenda is a report on championship funding. I will try to give you just a very brief, very premature report on championship funding as we understand it today. Obviously the Annual Reports provides you with historical data. What is at the top of everybody's mind is the block-grant concept that the Executive committee has acted on for Division II in 1986-87.

The concept of block-grant funding will be established by virtue of a committee. First of all, the concept obviously is that there is going to be a fixed dollar amount that Division II will have to take care of transportation and per diem for its championship events. That figure for Division II is \$1.1 million. It will be administered by a committee referred to as the Division II Championship Committee. That committee will replace the former Championship Standards Committee that operated for all three divisions. Its makeup will be two members of the Executive Committee, two members from the Council and one member at-large. That committee will be appointed after this Convention.

Basic Association policies are expected to remain in force. That is, to go from a limited championship to an all-comers meet, for example, will probably not be available. Championship budgets will be no different than they currently are, and if you have hosted a championship, you will understand what I mean. A budget will be presented by the host institution. It will be responsible for its expenditures, and the Association's budget will take care of deficits as it currently has. So the budgeting for the championship event will not be included in the \$1.1 million that will be available for the Division II championships.

The Division II Championship Committee's responsibility will be to determine things like championship format, degree of transportation and per diem that will be allowed, location of championships, travel-party sizes and the distribution of net receipts, plus the other things necessary for administering the championships. Generally overall policies will not be changed. Executive Regulations 1-1, which pertains to sports sponsorship percentages, Executive Regulation 1-2, which exacts a one to eight ratio for team sports and a one to 16 ratio for individual sports will probably remain the same. The awards will be standard throughout the Association.

Commercial-sponsorship requirements will be adhered to, and the use of the NCAA travel service will be mandated. There obviously would need to be some amendments to current Executive regulations, and those would have to be dealt with at upcoming Association Conventions.

Very briefly, that is about what we know about block-grant funding to this point. Whoever serves on that committee has got a lot of work to do. One of the biggest criticisms is those of us who need to go into budgeting for 1986-87, are not going to have the information we need. Chances are it is not going to be any different than last year, as far as not having the information we wanted; but hopefully this will make the Division II championships process less of a problem for us on our own campus.

The next order of business on our agenda is voting on legislation pertaining to Division II exclusively.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Division II Criteria

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): On behalf of the Council and Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Elwell: This legislation is self-explanatory. Current criteria requires sponsorship of four sports for men and women in Division II. Two of these must be team sports effective 1987. The two team sports requirement was introduced to require an institution to demonstrate a commitment to a program that would exceed a total emphasis on only one sport in Division II institutions.

The steering committee, in our discussions, feel that this commitment is demonstrated by sponsoring one of the two team sports in Division I, which in most instances would result in a greater financial commitment on the part of that institution that would normally be required to sponsor that same sport in Division II. Further, we believe that a Division II member that sponsors a team sport in Division I should receive credit for meeting the Division II requirements.

The steering committee is aware of several institutions that would not meet Division II criteria if this amendment is not adopted. These particular institutions have, indeed, more than four sports for men and women; but one of their team sports is classified as a Division I currently.

[Proposal No. 61 (page A-44) was approved.]

Limitations on Number of Contests

Robert J. Hiebert (California State University, Northridge): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hiebert: The intent of the motion is simply to give Division II maximum baseball scheduling in line with Division I.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-68) was approved (74-69).]

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council and for the Division II vice-president was presented. The slate was approved by acclamation.]

[The Division II Business Session was adjourned at 5 p.m.]

DIVISION III BUSINESS SESSION

Monday Morning, January 13, 1986

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. by Elizabeth A. Kruczak, Fitchburg State College, chair.

[Note: The reporter was not present at the beginning of the business session. The following begins with discussion in progress.]

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

Block-Grant Funding

Robert F. Riedel (Geneseo State University College): I should note that in Division III all of the gate receipts, the revenue that amounts to about \$260,000, will be retained by Division III for our championships. Now, even though we will be determining our own destiny, I think it is important for us to realize that we still must follow some of the basic policies that have been established by the Executive Committee. Such things as the ratio guidelines of one to eight and one to 16 certainly will have to be maintained. The commercial sponsorship policies will have to be maintained, the awards policies that now exist and the use of NCAA travel service and the Championship Committee travel also. The guidelines will have to be maintained in the conduct of Division III championships.

The Division III Championships Committee will have the responsibility of reviewing all the sports committee recommendations and determining competition format, the degree of funding, the location, travel-party size and also the distribution of net receipts. So in conclusion, this committee is going to have a very, very difficult assignment. I think it will experience a great deal of political pressure from our sports committees.

Ms. Kruczak: I have served on the Executive Committee with Bob during the past two years. He has certainly had Division III foremost in his mind, and he has fought for us hard and long during his term.

Academics

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College [Iowa]): Two years ago, we were embroiled in the most emotional political session in the history of the NCAA. You may remember it. We were running around with buttons on, there were people from other outside organizations handing out pamphlets, buttonholing the delegates in bars and restaurants and hallways, and the whole issue at that time was the involvement of presidents in the NCAA. The upshot of that meeting was the decision that we would not create an outside group of presidents whose function was to overrule the governance procedures of the NCAA.

On the contrary, a presidents organization would be established whose role would be to make the existing governing system more effective. I believe that is exactly what the Presidents Commission has done. You should know that the Division III presidents have been very much involved in the process. I know of no other presidents organization in which attendance has been so good.

The key accomplishment in the 18 months of the Presidents Commission was described by Tom Frericks in the former session in which we, through a survey, determined what the key problems were, elicited possible solutions, called a special Convention and produced an overwhelming Association-wide support of reform in athletics. The Division III role in this process is interesting

and important for you to know. Throughout all of those discussions of issues which were primarily Division I issues, the Division III presidents were involved in the discussions. It was not a federated approach. That is important to know, because I think that the future of our division and the future of the Association requires that we retain some format of exchange of ideas and information in the political process between all three of the divisions.

We were involved in it in an aggressive way. And from a shamefully immodest standpoint, I would say that many of the most penetrating and insightful comments came from Division III presidents. In addition to that, the Division III presidents on the Commission have worked hard to develop a liaison with the steering committee, with the Council members, the people that you have elected.

Last year, we met together. Yesterday, a delegate from the steering committee met with us, discussed with us the problems that the steering committee sees and we conferred with them on some of the difficult situations that we have perceived. In every report back to the Commission as a whole, the Division III report has included a reference to relationships of the steering committee, and this is the only division that has done that. Very significantly, yesterday at the Commission meeting, the Division I-A group announced that it felt it would be a good idea for the Division I presidents to meet with the Division I steering committee of the Council to begin the sort of thing that Division III has been doing all along.

And that is not the first time that Division III has given leadership to the total of the Association. Those of you with a theological bent might look at it in terms of the last shall be first. The current concerns, joint concerns of the steering committee and the Presidents Commission of Division III are these: We feel we must take a look at the option of establishing admissions and eligibility standards in Division III analogous to the item on the agenda for the other divisions at the present time, some form of Proposal No. 48. There is no consensus at all on this issue, but we sense it is one that we should look at.

We have asked the steering committee to proceed aggressively with the pursuit of limitations on playing seasons, which the presidents, I think, feel is a very important issue. We talked with them about the block grants, which as Bob Riedel has mentioned to you is a tremendous opportunity for us but a very difficult challenge.

We are looking at multidivision classification and that very, very complex arena of people from one division playing in another division and the particular problems that that creates for us. We also feel that the steering committee and the presidents should provide leadership in an analysis and a reappraisal of our financial aid regulations, not so much with a view toward changing them but with a view toward making them more clear and making them better known because of the problem that we continually run into of people who feel that other institutions really do not understand this the way we do. It is quite likely, I believe, that as a group we are doing a lot better at this than we think we are and are being overly influenced by reports of coaches unsuccessful in recruiting a particular athlete. The health of the division requires, it seems to us, a look at that question.

Just an observation about the future of the Presidents Commission. Yesterday I was asked to give a brief comment, sort of a swan song, since I will no longer be the chair of the Division III presidents, I will remain on the Commission, but they gave me an opportunity to comment on the future of the

Association. And let me tell you what I told the Commission presidents. I believe that the key to the future of the NCAA is resolving an identity crisis. What really is the function of the NCAA? Do we exist as an association to serve sports businesses or to serve educational institutions?

Now, I am not so foolish to think there is a simple answer to that question. Every college president who has had to balance a budget knows that the business side is very, very important. But every president at a commencement knows that there is an awful lot more involved than dollars. But that tension between a business and an educational institution must be balanced, including elements of both. And the balance that is achieved by the Association will have an awful lot to do with Division III because if we are in the business of supporting the business side of athletics, Division III is clearly nothing but a burden.

On the other hand, if we are concerned about the educational endeavor, it seems to me that Division III is the most persuasive evidence of the persistence of the traditional values of sport in the academic world.

Now, in that balancing process of negotiating one side against the other and the tensions of it, the Presidents Commission is going to play a key role. If the athletics directors of Division III must find a way to negotiate with the athletics directors of Division I, we are in a pretty tight spot. But if the presidents in the Commission are able, as they have been in the past, to engage in discourse across the divisional lines, I genuinely believe that there is hope for an appreciation of the role of Division III and growing strength for our involvement in the Association.

Now, certainly the emphasis on the academic has been the hallmark of what we have done this year in the Presidents Commission, and I am very, very hopeful about it for the future. Many of you know that I have put an awful lot of energy and emotion into these issues. And having done so, I am particularly pleased to be able to turn over the chair of the Division III commission to Jim Whalen, who is the president of Ithaca College.

Jim, I think, has a great measure of political sensitivity, and element of leadership charisma. He has commitment, integrity and a certain essential toughness that is just what we need.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): Yesterday I was told a story of the man who had a large estate and he used to give parties on this estate. On this estate, there was a very large pond, and in the pond there were many, many alligators. During one of his parties, he said if there is anyone brave enough to jump in that pond and swim across safely to the other side, they will have a choice of three options—the hand of my daughter, a million dollars or 30 acres of this very valuable real estate.

About that time as he was finishing, he heard a splash and he could see somebody swimming across the pond, and the man leaped out on the other side. So he rushed over to him, and he said, "Which one of these options would you like, my daughter, 30 acres or the million dollars?" The guy says, "None of those. I just want to find the guy who pushed me in." That is what it is going to be like this year, folks.

If there is one concern that I would like to reaffirm, one concern that I have had during my time associating with the NCAA and with the Presidents Commission, it is this vulcanization that we are seeing in the NCAA and this division structure. I think we need to think very carefully about it. The issues that concern us, that concern Division II and concern Division I are all of a

piece.

There is a C in NCAA, and nobody should forget that. That is the thing that binds us and ties us together, and if we forget that C, we will make a very serious mistake. I think all of you know that better than I do.

[*Note: The slate of candidates for Division III vacancies on the Council and for vice-president were presented and approved.*]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

Edwin D. Muto (State University of New York, Buffalo): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 37—B.

[The motion was seconded.]

The effective date is August 1, 1986, and the intent is to eliminate Divisions I and III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships. This amendment has been proposed due to the fact that the sport of track and field is the only sport sponsored by the Association that offers student athletes three separate national championship opportunities. Also, the significant cost associated with the indoor championships is another reason why the event should be discontinued. The Association subsidized 1985 indoor track championships in the total amount of \$353,000. The subsidy for all of the total 1984-85 championships program amounted to approximately \$5 million, of which \$1,558,000 or 32 percent was spent on cross country, indoor track and outdoor track.

For cross country, the subsidization by the organization was approximately eight percent of the total championships program. For indoor track, it was approximately seven percent of the championships program, and outdoor track was 17 percent or approximately one third of the total.

Further, a total of approximately 19,000 student-athletes participated in the 74 men's and women's 1984-85 NCAA championships; and approximately 4,000 athletes competed in men's and women's cross country, indoor track and outdoor track championships. Breaking down those figures comes to 22 percent of the student-athletes competing in the NCAA championships were track and field athletes, and that 21 percent received about a third or 32 percent of the funds used to subsidize NCAA championships.

Nell C. Jackson (State University of New York, Binghamton): I would like to speak against the motion for the following reasons. The nature of the sport of track and field is quite different from indoor to outdoor. There are different events. For the most part, there are different people who participate in the two championships, and, therefore, the rate of success of the individuals is quite different.

The season of outdoor track and field in the spring is quite limited. Most of the indoor track and field programs are located in the East because of the short season for outdoor track. Some of the schools are not able to field outdoor track teams because of the short season. Therefore, the majority of their students compete in the indoor season. If you eliminated the indoor track and field championships, I would question whether or not we are really serving the needs of the students who participate in track and field. I do not feel that you can look at indoor track and field and outdoor track and field in the same manner as a split season with baseball or tennis because of the different events and the different levels of participation.

Willard Huyck (University of the South): I ask that we retain the Division III championship in track and field for several reasons. The reasons cited for its abolition never mentioned the interest of the student-athletes or the unique geographical considerations that make these seasons very important to some schools.

When the Division I championship was making money, these concerns were never expressed. The NCAA felt that there was mismanagement, moved the division championship from Detroit, lost money and now asks us to forego a Division III championship as a result. We can do this without excessive expense. The schools can send people or not send people as they so choose, but it presents the opportunity for athletes to compete.

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): We have a very strong track program at Glassboro State. We experienced going indoors the first time last year. We sponsor 23 sports at Glassboro State. Somehow we find means to send the people who are worthy of going. And likewise, we believe in a broad-scope program. We think that Division III also believes in a broad-scope program.

We understand that finances are a problem; but by the same token, I think that the committee ought to look at eliminating the step of going from qualification to nationals and create perhaps a regional in between, even if the schools had to fund their own way.

Robert Dowd (Southeastern Massachusetts University): I believe of the two arguments for this proposal, one was the cost factor. From the Annual Reports of last year, I believe the cost of the indoor championships for men and women was a deficit somewhere of about \$21,000, which is hardly a high-cost sport. The other argument that was offered was that we are bringing too many track and field athletes to the nationals. In last year's Division III indoor meet, some of the events were limited to the top 10 efforts in the country, which is hardly a watering-down effect. I think that we do have a true championship caliber meet being run at this time. We would hate to think we are bringing in athletes by the hundreds to compete in these events.

[Proposal No. 37-B (page A-29) was defeated (85-105).]

Division III Criteria

Anthony J. Diekema (Calvin College): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

Since the membership in the NCAA is based on the principle of an overall institutional commitment to athletics, it is reasonable that there be a men's and a women's minimum established for team sports. In addition, this brings Division III into conformity with Divisions I and II, which already have a minimum number of team sports. It is my belief that this legislation will encourage a well-rounded sports program for both men and women in Division III.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-44) was approved.]

Division III Criteria

Robert T. Shields (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

What this does is to give us some basal minimal standards. We have requirements for four programs, what constitutes a sport, what consti-

tutes how many people participating in order to call it a sport, how many contests must be played. The thing that should be remembered about No. 63 is that looking at the amendments to the amendments no one in Division III felt that it was essential to change any of those numbers. It also would be important to point out that the effective date is not until September of 1987, so that we will meet as Division III in Convention one more time prior to the implementation of this particular piece of legislation.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): It seems like over the last number of years, one of the things that we in Division III have prided ourselves in is the fact that we have been able to get along without a lot of rules and regulations and without enlarging the book and creating numbers and limitations for our schools. It has been nice that schools have been able to determine what is right and appropriate for their own institution in their own area with their own special problems. Even though I can go along with what is here, I just wonder if this is not the first step toward bringing us into conformance with Divisions I and II. I do not think we want to be in conformance with Divisions I and II. We have our own set of circumstances and our own unique problems; and if we have been able to function without having minimum numbers and legislation like this, why put it in now?

Mr. Shields: In effect, what you say may have been true up to the point at which we were in August of 1985 when we brought all of the women's programs into compliance with all the rules. At that particular point, we needed some definition, if you will, of what constitutes a sport, what is a season. Can you play two tennis matches? Is that a sport? Can you play three softball games? Is that a sport? Certainly, if you have a wrestling team and you only have four people and you have ten weight classes, it is very difficult to say you have a wrestling program. If the numbers are a stumbling block, as I have indicated, amendments can be made to this legislation to lower them to what you think is a more reasonable figure prior to its implementation in September of 1987.

John R. Brazil (Southeastern Massachusetts University): A point of clarification. Since B under Section 4 establishes minimum number of contests, I assume that means minimum number of contests in a sport that is used to qualify as a sport under section B, No. 63.

Mr. Shields: Yes. Because No. 62 passes, Section A of No. 63 is moot.

Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): A point of clarification. I wonder if you can tell us what constitutes a contest as an exhibition game, scrimmage, what have you, on the schedule, stated on the official schedule. Does a scrimmage or exhibition game count as a contest?

Ms. Kruczak: A contest is anything for which you have a contract, a written agreement.

Mr. Spiotti: Also, we have a sport at our institution that frequently competes against club programs. Can you tell me if a contest versus a club program constitutes an official contest?

Ms. Kruczak: No, it does not.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): If you look at the proposal, it says that scheduled contests that are canceled or not completed in accordance with the playing rules of the sport in question may not be counted. I am looking at a scenario of a school in New York or Massachusetts where you have an extremely tough spring, and you have to cancel a number of matches—tennis or baseball or lacrosse or whatever for a variety of reasons, and you end up eventually not playing many games because of weather. Does

that mean that your team or individuals are not going to be qualified to compete in the postseason championship for that sport because you have not fulfilled the requirement.

Mr. Shields: I guess that would be the case. Many of us in the northern tier will schedule 25 games in the hope that we get 12 in. Many of us are in that boat. If you have scheduled only six games because that is the minimum standard and you only play five, it is not very realistic that the selection committee for the sports committee is going to even consider you if you play six. These are minimums. I doubt if you are 6-0 that you would get much consideration from the sports committee.

Ms. Kruczak: It says the Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting may approve exceptions to the minimum number of collegiate contests or minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution. Therefore, weather conditions would be taken into consideration.

John Zinda (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): I would like to just raise a question of conference affiliation. For schools that have to sponsor a number of sports to become member of conference, would these playing dates, number of dates be applicable to the conferences in order to sponsor a sport? In a conference situation where you are to be a member of a conference, you must sponsor a certain number of sports, far more than the number of sports that are asked for in this particular legislation. Teams that do not have these numbers that have to abide by NCAA situations all year round in order to be eligible in all their sports, would they have to meet that? Would they just have to meet the minimum?

Mr. Shields: My own interpretation is just the minimum. But if you have a conference, in a conference and you are playing a round robin, in order to qualify, I think it is the same. This is a membership criteria. This is a requirement in order to be a member of Division III in the NCAA. It is divisional criteria.

John R. Brazil (Southeastern Massachusetts University): Let me make one more stab at this because I think many people are confused by it. No. 62 established Division III criteria at four and four—four male and four female. The minimum number of participants, the minimum number of contests apply to those four and four, not to others.

Mr. Shields: That is exactly right. That is the point. If as a condition of membership you have to have four sports for men and four sports for women, what constitutes a sport and what constitutes a season is what No. 63 does.

Mr. Brazil: Do you not list on your NCAA membership all the sports that you are going to sponsor? You cannot pick and choose, then, between the four and the list of 18 or 20 or 15 or whatever.

Mr. Shields: You only need four to qualify. It has to be one of the sports recognized by the NCAA.

Ms. Kruczak: Just to clarify, when we make out our compliance form and we list all the sports, you also fill out another form that says how many participants you have and how many contests you have. This legislation does not mean that you are not going to be eligible for the championship if you do not compete in this number of contests and have this number of participants in all of your sports.

What this is dealing with is just the membership criteria. In other words, for you to meet the membership criteria of four sports for men, four sports for

women plus two team sports for both men and women, you must have four sports for men that can meet these criteria. If you have eight sports for men, that is fine; but four of them must meet these minimum criteria.

James Migli (New York Maritime): We have a situation where we only have 52 female cadets. And a problem arises for us to put competitive teams on the floor. One of the sports we have is basketball, in which we have seven girls. How can I compete in 18 contests. They just cannot do it. Am I entitled to a waiver on this?

Ms. Kruczak: Later on in the Convention, there is a proposal by the Division III Steering Committee which will provide that waiver provision for the Council to make that waiver provision. So that was anticipated as being a problem, especially for Division III.

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-44) was approved.]

Transfer Rule—Division III

Patricia A. Thompson (Elmira College): On behalf of the Council and the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit a student who transfers to a Division III institution from a nonmember four-year institution after competing at the previous institution to be immediately eligible if the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the previous institution. This proposal is consistent with other Division III legislation that allows a transfer from another Division III to transfer and participate immediately. A transfer from a Division I or a Division II may do the same. However, a transfer from a nonmember is not currently eligible to transfer and participate immediately.

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-54) was approved.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. Kruczak: Continuing with the legislation, individual members of the steering committee have proposed an overview of the proposals of interest to Division III.

Consent Packages

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I would like some clarification on Proposal No. 13. Just what it means.

Thomas M. Kinder (Bridgewater College [Virginia]): No. 13 is already in the book in other places. The actual proposal simply means that if there is a National Collegiate Championship in a sport in Division III and there is no other championships in I or II, the Division III championship would become a national collegiate championship. There will only be one championship. It will be a national championship. That legislation was passed last year, and this is simply bringing it into focus here.

Robert Dowd (Southeastern Massachusetts University): Am I correct to assume, since we just voted to retain the indoor track championships in Division III—Division II already does not have an indoor track championship—if Division I voted this morning to eliminate its championships, does this mean, if this is passed, No. 13, that our indoor Division III championships would be open to all divisions?

Mr. Kinder: That is correct.

Mr. Dowd: I would think, then, that this consent package is no longer

considered noncontroversial.

Judith Sweet (University of California, San Diego) I would like to make a couple of comments. First of all, if, in fact, what was just described occurs this morning and Division I votes out the indoor track and field championship, after a period of two years, the Division III championships would revert to an open championship. It would no longer be a Division III championship. It would not mean that people are coming to a Division III championship. What it would mean is there only would be an open championship, and we would no longer have Division III qualify times that everybody else would be meeting. That is a concern of the Division III steering committee. There are many issues tied in with the block-grant funding that have not had an opportunity to be addressed yet since that committee formally has not been structured. So many of these things that we are talking about are still in the question-mark stage, and it is very difficult for us to give you any specific information.

The Division III steering committee is as uncomfortable with No. 13 as I am hearing being expressed from some of you. That is part of the reason that we presented the consent package to you. There is an opportunity to remove any item in the consent package and have it voted on separately. So that is an opportunity for us.

Mr. Galaris: Can we get a straw vote on how we feel about No. 13?

Ms. Kruczak: I know I will have to remove myself from the chair for a minute, but there are four ways that the steering committee has tried to deal with this issue. First, we can ask the Council at its meeting tonight to withdraw it. Second, we can ask that it be taken out of the consent package; so that, in fact, the membership of the entire Convention can vote on that separately.

What I had asked at a special meeting this morning was whether we can change the effective date. In changing the effective date, I was told this morning that it would not have many implications. Inasmuch as this says immediately, this is just to clear up what happened in August 1984 at an Executive Committee meeting. It is to clarify. It already has been determined that if there is to be only one championship, it must be open. So this has no bearing on that.

What this has a bearing on is just in counting the numbers, and I am talking Division III. They cannot count our numbers twice. And this is what has been one of the items in the past. Now this says they cannot count our numbers twice. In other words, Division I and Division II would have to have the percentage of numbers necessary to sponsor a championship.

So, therefore, if Divisions I and II do not have enough numbers to have a championship, it means that the championship must be an open championship for all divisions. And that is what is now, in fact, in existence; but this clarifies just how you can count the numbers.

Just to give you a little rationale behind the Division III Steering Committee's concern over this as expressed by some of the members to us before the Convention. Now, to be real truthful, I think Division III is very concerned about women's soccer. We put the championship in. But after two years, it could revert back to a national championship. That would be some of the implications.

Also another concern expressed in the steering committee is that, in fact, with the other divisions lowering their divisional membership criteria, possibly some of them will be dropping a sport, which could again have implications for some of our other championships.

So again, this is why we flag you on this today. Possibly you would like to

hear discussion of it in the Convention. If this is true, then what we would have to do is ask that it be taken out of the consent package. So I think we are going to vote in a couple ways.

[*Note: In a straw vote, the delegates voted to remove Proposal No. 13 from the consent package but were indecisive about asking the Council to withdraw the proposal.*]

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I suspect there is some confusion on just what this means. My understanding of that piece of legislation is that we will provide the numbers in Division III to have a national championship and, in effect, be excluded because our Divisions I or II friends will take all the positions. You couple that with the issue of the block grants this year, and I think at this juncture we have to ask the Council to withdraw this completely until the Championships Committee has had an opportunity to meet.

Ms. Kruczak: I would just like to add to that. The Council this morning referred it to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee sustained its action and will not recommend that the Council withdraw it.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): This is one of those instances, folks, where we are caught between a rock and a hard place. And we ought to know it. It is going to hurt before it is over if, in fact, in some of our minds it is not already hurting. The fact of the matter is that this is the way the Executive Committee is pretty well functioning now. How do I say this nicely? The fact of the matter is you have to be political, folks. The Council right now will not vote to remove this from the agenda. You simply do not have those votes on the 44- or 46-member Council to get this thing removed from the agenda. And so that may be one of the three options, but that is a no-option option.

In terms of voting it down on the floor of the Convention, that is probably your best option. And to do that, you folks, if, in fact, you sincerely believe that you want to vote this down, you had better work like you have not worked for a long time. You had better work, first of all, internally within Division III to make sure that you are all there when the vote is taken. You had better make sure that you vote together as a group. You had better lean on your comrades within your division who might dissent; try and change their opinion.

Then you had better go to work on people outside your division. If you have friends in Divisions I and III that have paddles that are going to be voting, you had better talk to those people. Do not wait until it gets on the floor. Tell them ahead of time what you plan to do. Tell them that you want their support. We are a large body. We are a very diverse body. We have our diversities within Division III. We also have some very large diversities across all of the divisions. Part of what we do is, I scratch your back, you scratch my back. And if any of you ave any chits out there that you can call in because of past back-scratching, if you feel strongly about No. 13, you had better call in your chits. Because it is time to get the politics together.

Mr. Kinder: I would just like to say, this is a controversial issue; therefore, I think it should be removed from the consent package.

Allen F. Ackerman (Elmhurst College): If I understood what has taken place—if this is stuff that has been pulled together from other places in the NCAA Manual—if we vote this down, does it make any difference anyway?

Ms. Kruczak: No. This is really just clarifying it. I know the concern has been that this is something new. It is not new. It is an executive regulation, and this is just to clear up the final detail of that interpretation. In fact, to say you

cannot count a division twice in the total count that you need to have a championship.

And in essence, it is saying in the background that if there is one championship and can only be one championship, it will be an open championship. Possibly some people felt that if this was not in there, that they might feel freer to be a little more creative in seeing how our championships are going to go. This immediately will not have an effect. That is why we thought maybe even if we changed the date it would help. We still have that leeway time. There is still a Convention next year before this would have an effect or could have an effect on some of the Division III championships.

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): I would like to make two points. First of all, I think we should attempt to defeat it, to send a message. Number two, I am sort of concerned that the proposal was brought to us as a noncontroversial proposal, and the discussion on the floor was brought up, and all of a sudden it became very controversial. Why was it not presented originally as a very controversial proposal?

Ms. Kruczak: Well, again, because in preparing the legislation, it is already in the Manual. This is just to clarify. And the consent package is there, which is usually housekeeping, clarifying. Possibly people are looking a little beyond and asking what effect this really might have. But this is right now, this is not changing anything that we have right now. Because these decisions were made in August of 1984.

Maureen T. Noran (Drew University): At this time right now, is there nothing in the bylaws or constitution that says the Division III numbers cannot be counted to determine a national championship and still be counted for a Division III championship? Is that what this is all about?

Ms. Sweet: My understanding is that if there is a Division III championship in a particular sport, that the numbers from Division III cannot be counted in order to meet the requirements for an open championship so that Divisions I and II would be able to continue or start an open championship.

Ms. Kruczak: As we cannot do anything officially here, possibly the Division III steering committee will see that someone does stand on the floor—and if anybody here wishes to do it, we welcome you—to ask that this be taken out of the consent package and voted on separately. From there, you can give your alternatives or options as to which way you would like the Convention to vote on it.

In regards to whether or not this currently exists, I would like to try to clarify a question that was asked earlier on whether this situation currently exists. The new information that I have is, yes, it exists because the Executive Committee had given that interpretation. But it could not be official without this piece of legislation. That is why the legislation is before you. It is not in the Manual, that is correct.

What the proposal does is add more information to what currently is in the book and what we feel is that locks our hands in a way that currently does not exist as it is written. That is why we are concerned. That is why we would like to have a little more time to work through this.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Elmer W. Yoest (Otterbein College): The Presidents Commission grouping is a follow-up from the June special Convention. No. 19 was directed by Proposal No. 5, which was a resolution passed at that Convention. And what it does is affirms that the student-athletes are responsible for their involvement

in any violations and that restoration of eligibility will require very good evidence.

Proposal No. 20, limitation on numbers in contests, follows guidelines of Proposal No. 8 from last June. It limits those contests that can exceed the numbers of contests criteria in basketball. In other words, a basketball team can only play or count one contest outside the limits.

The resolution on enforcement follows up again with the compliance program. It speaks to those committees that are involved, the Eligibility Committee and the Executive Committee, the Presidents Commission and the Council in working through 1987 to see or to put those guidelines in force and to offer any new legislation that would be necessary.

Financial Aid

No. 22 moves the financial aid legislation out of the constitution and puts it into the bylaws. I believe that that piece of legislation will be moved and then will be referred because there is a problem. It speaks to the cost of education and the definition of the cost of education; and there needs to be some caps put on that, because there are many, many different ways in which institutions determine what their cost of education is or what the expenses are.

Proposal Nos. 23 and 24 deal with Pell grants. No. 23 would accept the full Pell grant, which means a student-athlete can go as much as \$2,000 if he got the full grant above what is legitimate expenses. No. 24 would raise it \$500. Right now it is currently \$900 that is allowable. This would raise it up to \$1,400.

Proposal No. 25 is a Council-sponsored piece of legislation, and it permits the student-athlete to receive financial aid beyond the specified time the legislation that now exists provides—five years and six years. Proposal No. 26 would permit the student-athlete to receive financial aid during the summer prior to the freshman year. Proposal No. 27 puts criteria into the awards that are already established in high school or college that may have been awarded to athletes, honorary awards.

[Note: The delegates received a presentation on the general round table topic of drug education and continued with their review of proposed legislation.]

General

Patricia A. Thompson (Elmira College): I would like to start with Proposal No. 31, which is a resolution on gambling. Proposal Nos. 32, 33 and 34 have been withdrawn. I will highlight only those that pertain to Division III. Proposal No. 38, criteria for the conduct of championships, permits Divisions II and III Championship Committees to continue existing II or III championships for 1986 and 1987.

Proposal No. 46, the tryout rule, limits the application of the tryout rule to prospective student-athletes who have begun the ninth grade or are 15 years old. It also defines what open competition is. Proposal No. 47—sports camps, coaching, school and clinics—incorporates all the camp rules that are in various positions in our Manual into a new bylaw.

Membership and Classification

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): Proposal No. 55 was presented by the Division III steering committee and was supported by the Council. This answers the question that was asked earlier. This proposal will give the Council and primarily the Division III steering committee the authority to grant waivers of the four-sport sponsorship requirements for

membership in the Association for both men and women when the institution can present data that indicates that its enrollment ratios do not qualify it to meet the sports sponsorship requirements. So, for example, in the case of the delegate who mentioned that they have only seven basketball players because they have a limited number of women in the institution, this would provide them an opportunity to ask for a waiver and to be granted a waiver in that case.

With Proposal No. 64, we are trying to establish a three-year waiting period from the time an institution changes its membership from one division to another before it is eligible for the national championship. I think I should mention, and if you note it in the amendments, that the effective date will be September 15th rather than September 1. The reason for the change in the effective date is that there are some institutions which thought they were playing under the rules of a two-year requirement. They have been waiting for two years and would be eligible on September 1. But if this becomes effective on September 1, they have to wait five years, so that is why the effective date has been changed.

Turning to No. 66, which is the one that has been sponsored by the Council and I think is the one that is particularly relevant, I might say that this motion was on the floor last year. I think there was a great deal of misunderstanding, and I hope that we can clarify this. I am sorry that people have left because I think this is a rather critical issue. This permits a Division II institution to petition to be classified in Division III in a sport if there is a Division III championship in that sport but there is no Division II championship.

Let me just list the cases where this would be true. Field hockey; ice hockey; women's soccer; women's gymnastics; men's and women's lacrosse, and if the indoor track championships motion is upheld as we voted this morning, it would include men's and women's indoor track. I think these are the important points that should be noted. If they reclassify a sport in Division III, they must meet all the requirements of Division III and that includes no scholarships. If a student decides to participate—and let us use field hockey as an example—and the participant also plays lacrosse, in neither case can they have a scholarship. If they did not reclassify their lacrosse program and it is still in Division II and she receives a scholarship in lacrosse, she cannot play in the field hockey championship; she cannot participate in that sport. They cannot receive a scholarship in one sport and play in the one that they have classified in Division III. I want to be sure that you all understand the scholarship problem. There is strong support on the Division III steering committee to support this amendment, because we think then that everyone is playing under the same rules.

However, I also wish to add that if they reclassify a sport in Division III, it cannot count in their sports sponsorship. So they must have four sports for men and four sports for women in Division II. If they elect to reclassify a sport in Division III, that will not count as one of their four sports to meet the sport sponsorship requirement.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I have two questions. Who does the petition go to that would then reclassify? Does it go to the Council or does it go to the steering committee? And the second, I assume that this means a school could petition to come down to Division III championship in more than one sport.

Ms. Mulvaney: Yes. It could be in more than one sport. Every time they reclassify, they lose that sport in their sports sponsorship. So, for example, if

they would do all of the sports listed here, that means they would have to have all those plus four more in order to meet the membership requirement. Your other question was who does the petition go to? It will go to the Classification Committee and to the Council.

Robert Dowd (Southeastern Massachusetts University): I would just like to state that there is a bigger difference between Division II athletics and Division III athletics than solely a scholarship. And by not giving a scholarship to an athlete, I think that this does not automatically make a Division II program philosophically similar to a Division III program. I think we should keep that in mind when we vote.

[The session was recessed at 11 a.m.]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1986

The session convened at 3 p.m. with Elizabeth A. Kruczak, chair, presiding.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. Kruczak: To start this afternoon's session, we would like to clarify a question that was raised this morning as far as the minimum number of contests. When we count minimum number of contests, you can only count contests against four-year, varsity, intercollegiate teams. In the other divisions where they have maximum limits—where we have limits as far as basketball is concerned—you count all competition.

So, therefore, there is the difference in this legislation that is proposed to you today. It is the four-year, intercollegiate, varsity competition. Possibly just a friendly reminder, having heard a few cases for waiver of our 50 percent competition rule, it has been to the institution's advantage that there be a contract. You could not have the event because of weather or somebody canceled out, but you had a written contract in hand so that is always very, very helpful backup information when you come for a waiver. Hopefully, most of you in all our sports do have a contract with all four-year, varsity, intercollegiate contests. Steve Morgan has come to try and clear up our misconceptions about Proposal No. 13.

Steven R. Morgan (NCAA): I understood that there were some questions raised this morning about Proposal No. 13. I knew before this morning that there was some controversy about Proposal No. 13. The steering committee had discussed it and had raised issues with the Council. This morning the Executive Committee met and discussed Proposal No. 13 and the background of it as well.

You will recall that the whole issue, the larger issue that No. 13 is a small part of really, came to a head last year when it did become clear that there were sufficient Division III sponsors of two sports, particularly women's soccer and women's lacrosse, to justify a Division III championship. At that time, however, there existed only a National Collegiate Championship; and while all Division III institutions were eligible for that National College Championship, there were not a lot of Division III institutions competing in that division. There was a concern that Division III institutions numbers were really justifying a championship that they were not getting an opportunity to participate in. That was the background we started from.

Several institutions raised the issue of creating a Division III championship in those two sports. As that issue was reviewed by the Executive Committee, it became abundantly clear that if Division III created championships in those

sports, it raised questions about what would happen to Divisions I and II, which looked at independently could not justify divisional championships nor could they continue to justify a National Collegiate Championship. Out of that discussion came the feeling that there should never be a championship sport in the Association for which there were divisions that were not eligible. The idea was that there should be a championship opportunity in every sport in which the Association conducted championships if you could qualify for it on merit, which, of course, then reinvites the question about how do Division III institutions get into the national collegiate championship.

In addressing the issue, the Executive Committee concurred with the authority of Division III to create its own championships in those two sports, leaving the National Collegiate Championship as an opportunity for Divisions I and II. In doing that, the question was raised, well, how are those championships justified, what happens?

The Executive Committee took the position that the National Collegiate Championship could continue to exist under the provision that says that a championship that does not meet the minimum sports sponsorship percentages can last for up to two years. The National Collegiate Championship could continue for two years and then if there was not sufficient sponsorship of the sport outside of Division III to continue to justify that championship, it would disappear. After that time, and at the Executive Committee's recommendation, legislation was proposed for last year's Convention to indicate that if there was only one championship in a sport, it would be a National Collegiate Championship.

That was adopted and became Executive Regulation 1-1-(e). So that is in the book and is in place. If there is only one continuing or newly established championship, it shall be a National Collegiate Championship open to all three divisions.

Now, in completing the implementation of what the Executive Committee had recommended and what had been adopted as legislation in regard to the creation and continuation of championships, after last year's Convention, the Executive Committee and Council determined that it would be helpful to have in the Executive Regulations a specific indication of how institutions were counted in these kind of hybrid situations where you had both a national collegiate championship and a division championship.

The Executive Committee had operated under the theory that if you had both, the same institutions could not be counted to justify both, so that Division III institutions in this particular circumstance would be counted to justify the Division III championship but they could not also be relied upon to justify the national collegiate championship. That had been the Executive Committee's position initially and continued to be the position of the committee.

In order to make it clear that that was the way the legislation operated and to be consistent with the Executive Committee's action, the Council determined to put forward what it considered a housekeeping proposal, which is No. 13.

The Executive Committee met again this morning to look at this same issue and confirmed and affirmed that it believed that No. 13 did what originally the Executive Committee had sought to do and was an appropriate part of completing that implementation. Now, as a part of that issue, the Executive Committee discussed, as has the Council, other factors that surround this whole issue, one of them being what is to occur now in the way of divisional

autonomy in this era of block-grant funding of championships. Are each of the divisions to get greater autonomy to sponsor championships in whatever sports they wish and spread their dollars however they wish to provide whatever championship opportunities are appropriate?

At the present time, because of the existence of the block-grant program, there is no different authority to create or maintain championships that do not meet the sponsorship percentages. I believe that it is fair to say that the championships committees in each of the divisions that will be implemented shortly after this Convention will consider this as one of the topics on which they want to make recommendations.

There is a proposal before you at this Convention to authorize the championships committees to continue at least for 1986-87 all divisional championships that are currently in place regardless of what happens to the sponsorship numbers, the theory there being that we should mark time through 1986-87, get the block-grant funding committees in place and then decide whether, for the 1987 Convention, looking at 1987-88 and future championships years, there are issues that should be addressed with new legislation, perhaps to totally alter the minimum sponsorship types of criteria that we have in place.

So I think the bottom line on all of this is that Proposal No. 13 merely affirms the action taken last year by the Executive Committee. Failure to adopt it would not in my opinion change what the Executive Committee did a year ago, but it would leave us in the same circumstance we were a year ago. That is, the executive regulations would essentially be silent on the point. So that's the background. I will be glad to answer questions or comments.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I have these two thoughts on that matter. First of all, I suspect that many of us did not understand the implications of what one national championship meant and how it would be applied. I do not see it as housekeeping; and I think if this body, Division III, puts its seal of approval on No. 13, in effect we are sanctioning something that is an executive regulation right now.

My second thought is, given the proposals with block-grant funding and all other changes that will be occurring over the next year, it would be a bit premature for us to jump into this today without seeing what some of the ramifications are of the block-grant proposal.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): A year from now when, in lacrosse, for instance, the national championship for Divisions I and II may disappear, does that put the Division III championship back into a situation where all schools are then considered for selection. If that's the case, would it not be appropriate for the steering committees or the Council to look at some kind of a ratio formula for entry into that national tournament and you take the number of slots that are allocated for the tournament and somehow designate two of those for Division I, one of them for Division II and the remainder for Division III and seed the tournaments that way. That might be something to consider for the future. At least that would guarantee Division III schools a chance to be part of that tournament.

Mr. Morgan: The answer to your questions really do not rest in No. 13. The answer to your first question about what happens if there is not sufficient sponsorship in Divisions I and II to continue to justify the National Collegiate Championship is that the Division III championship then becomes one for which all divisions are eligible and would be called a National Collegiate

Championship. Now, the larger question is how could the field be made up for that championship so that there could be minimum guaranteed slots for Division III institutions in the championship. The answer to that is, yes, there could be. The Executive Committee has the authority to format the championship in that regard. The answer is also that to date the Executive Committee has been hesitant to do that kind of thing because of its concern that all the teams in the championship be roughly competitive with one another and that it would not want to provide guaranteed slots for teams that really did not have a reasonable chance of beating some of the other teams in the tournament for the national championship.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): Has the Executive Committee considered eliminating the regulation that says if there is one championship, it has to be an open championship?

Mr. Morgan: The Executive Committee does not have the authority to eliminate that, because the Constitution states that Executive Regulation 1-1, the first article of the executive regulations, can only be amended by the annual Convention. The Convention voted last year to include that specific paragraph, so the only way it could get back out now is for the entire Convention to act on it. In order to do that, of course, it would have to be submitted by the appropriate deadline, so we are looking at the 1987 Convention as the first opportunity for any authority. The Executive Committee could not do it. The Convention would be the first authority, and it would have to wait until then.

John R. Brazil (Southeastern Massachusetts University): I am a little concerned by the representation of this as merely affirming something that already exists. If, in fact, the membership rejects that interpretation, does that not mean that the Division III members can be counted and, therefore, there is much more of a likelihood that there will continue to be a Division III and a National Collegiate Championship?

Mr. Morgan: I think that is a question the Executive Committee would have to address if it chose to reconsider its previous action. I do not know whether you can specifically interpret a defeat of this proposal as a rejection of that interpretation.

Edward W. Malan (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I am a little concerned by your comment that a defeat of this is not an immediate repudiation of the interpretation the Executive Committee has placed on legislation. Now, they may not, it seems to me after a no-vote by the Convention, they may not choose to interpret the issue the same way. They can choose to interpret it any other way but not that way.

Mr. Morgan: I would tend to agree with you that a rejection is not necessarily a repudiation. While I tend to agree with you that a no-vote is not, would not necessarily be taken as a repudiation, I would suggest that an affirmative vote on this question would certainly be looked upon as Division III approving of this concept. I do not think that is the case, and that is why I suggest a deferral of any action on this particular proposal.

Governance

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): Proposal No. 81 is the amendment that requires the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee to nominate at least two candidates for each vacant position, and it also requires the committees to request nominees from the membership and to mail copies of their proposed nominees to the membership by at least November 22 each year. Let me just call to your

attention that currently there is a request for nominees. I am sure you saw the nomination form in The NCAA News. Several times it was mentioned in the News that you could submit nominees. The same thing is true even for sports committees. If you will note whenever there is a vacancy, they ask for suggestions and nominations. In addition, the nominees were mailed to you with your Official Program, which this particular year happened to be November 22.

I think the real crux of this particular amendment is the requirement for two nominees. I think I should mention that the Council is not in favor of this motion for several reasons. First in the case of just Division III, for the three positions that were open, there were only 10 nominations received. Some of those were automatically eliminated for several reasons. Either they were not in the proper region or, more specifically, there was a nominee from a conference already represented and you cannot have two representatives from the same conference unless it is a man and a woman. In some cases, two men and two women from the same conference were nominated and therefore, were automatically eliminated.

So actually, looking at even this particular year, we barely would have had a slate if we would have had one at all. I think we need to look at this in terms of it being more a selective process rather than a nominating process. We hear the comment very often that it is not democratic; and in any democratic process, there are two nominees. You have every right and I mean seriously every right to nominate people from the floor if they meet the particular requirement, and the requirement might be regional, it might be sex. There must be at least three women in each division; and if there is a vacancy, then you must therefore be sure that requirement is met. I would like to announce that Proposal No. 84 has been withdrawn. Thank you.

Eligibility

Robert W. Hatch (Bates College): Four of the three proposals that I have been asked to talk about here are Nos. 68, 75, 77 and 79. There is an amendment to No. 68 that you may want to refer to, 68-1, which extends the effective date one year. Proposal No. 69 has to do with seasons of competition. I assume you will probably defeat this since this morning you defeated 37-B. But there is, of course, as I understand it, the possibility that that could be overturned in the General Business Session with a two-thirds vote.

No. 75 is to extend the transfer to junior colleges similar to the existing one. No. 79 is to extend the transfer rule to include nonmembers of the NCAA. No. 77, Division I now has this, and this is to provide a way for Divisions II and III.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): Would you take a minute to explain No. 77 just a little further. I am a bit confused from what has been said and how that relates to the other five-year rule proposal.

Mr. Hatch: Well, it is to provide for additional waivers by a two-thirds vote, and this is a provision that Division I already has. It is just to bring Divisions II and III into line.

Bob Dowd (Southeastern Massachusetts University): Regarding Proposal No. 70, I am wondering what the reason is this has been proposed by the Council? Has there been a problem with this particular rule?

Ms. Sweet: Originally there was a problem with it for Division III where our athletes were being wooed away to Division I and Division II institutions. Last year, we passed the legislation that prohibited the students from receiving athletically related financial aid. They could play if they transferred, but they

could not receive aid. Apparently the problem has extended itself very much into Division I, where it has become very difficult to administer; and we are hearing from Division I conferences particularly that they are having a great deal of difficulty with this. I also have heard that there are still Division III institutions that are having problems, even with that extra clause placed in there that the athlete cannot receive athletically related aid.

It does not help Division III, since our transfer rule has pretty much been addressed from all other standpoints. It really helps Division I and Division II. Division II seems to be the one group that is most supportive of retaining it.

Playing and Practice Seasons

Jeffrey Vennell (Kenyon College): About Proposal No. 91, I called legislative services to find out what their rationale was for putting limitations on all sports; and the way I read this, the interpretation I have gotten, is that if this passes, both in the sport of volleyball and soccer, postseason competition in soccer and volleyball would be prohibited. I guess my reaction to it is twofold. One is that if we want to put limitations on our seasons, I think we should draw legislation up ourselves.

The other is I find it somewhat interesting that when they are trying to legislate against further expansion, that they then exempt themselves from that and do not do that for the rest of us. I also read this that for Division I people, they could play soccer, for example, during the summertime because there is no end to their season with this legislation. I think it is poorly written, and I hope, having talked to them, they are going to put it back to Council or withdraw it. If they do not, I would urge us to vote against it.

Amateurism

Thomas M. Kinder (Bridgewater College [Virginia]): Proposal Nos. 105 and 106 are both proposals from the Professional Sports Liaison Committee dealing with students and professionalism. These are more or less guidelines to follow. No. 107 permits member institutions to pay expenses for the student-athlete for drug rehabilitation.

With No. 108, the Council felt that this was a little unclear the way it is written at this present time. I think the Council will oppose this simply because it is very difficult to understand what they mean by professional growth and development, and this could get into meaning a whole lot of different things to a whole lot of different people.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Special NCAA Self-Study Advisory Committee

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): At the fifth special Convention last summer, the delegates passed legislation to become effective at the end of that Convention. The first proposal was an institutional self-study of athletics, and the intent of that legislation was to require an institution as a condition and obligation of membership in the Association to conduct a self-study of its intercollegiate athletics programs at least once every five years with a forum and supporting information to be available for examination by an authorized representative of the Association. This is just some background so that you know what has transpired since that legislation was passed.

The Administrative Committee appointed the Special NCAA Self-Study Advisory Committee, and its intent and purpose was to advise the American Institutes of Research, AIR, on the development of terms necessary to implement the self-study requirements as adopted by the Convention.

AIR is a professional association in California that specializes in drafting documents for this purpose. Mr. Stephen Jung of AIR developed a draft document, and it was predicated on his survey of 15 individuals suggested by the NCAA who had considerable experience in the critical incidents, critical incidents in quotations, of corrosion that should be reflected in a study. This means that those 15 institutions or representatives of those institutions had had some problems.

Mr. Jung developed a document, and this draft document was circulated to the Steering Committees of each division who in turn made recommendations for the next draft. So your steering committee has had an opportunity to review this document, and it was forwarded to the advisory committee with comments and recommendations supporting Division III prospective in terms of redrafting this document or reconsidering the total document. The advisory committee was represented by each division. We met and reviewed and amended the document and agreed that this particular document should be piloted; that is, specific institutions, three or four in each division, should have a chance to self-administer. The revised document of the recommendations would be sent directly to Mr. Steve Jung, who was in charge of correlating all the recommendations and comments that were made.

Now, at this date, the pilots have been returned and will be reviewed at this Convention, as a matter of fact, this evening; and we hope that the document will be finalized by August 1986. The document, as it now stands, investigates and explores the following components of all divisional athletics programs, and let me just read these to you because they are pretty much all-encompassing.

It is prefaced by an introduction obviously, and then an instructional guide for completing this ISSG. The table of contents generally revolve around, No. 1, institutional purpose in and athletics philosophy. In each of these areas there will be a series of questions that are to be answered. The second area is the authority of the chief executive officer in personnel and financial affairs. The third area deals with the athletics program, organization and administration. The fourth area, athletics program finances. Fifth area, employment of athletics program personnel. Sixth area deals with the sport program. The seventh area deals with recruiting, admissions and eligibility. The eighth area deals specifically with services for student-athletes. The ninth area deals with the student-athlete profiles.

This instrument is divided into each of these nine sections with a series of questions to be answered, and all questions will be weighted. The questions are weighted so that a no response to any of these questions is considered very serious or minor. This would signify their importance to the institution. As you accumulate the responses at the end, you would have some feel as to whether or not your program is in serious trouble and whether or not there are some serious flags that are being waved to you that you need to work in this particular area.

All the questions are suffixed with a nonapplicable response so as to allow for Divisions II, III and multi-classification institutional response.

I mentioned that the document will be reviewed this evening and probably finalized and have maybe one more go-round in terms of potential three or four more institutions to pilot before it is ready for distribution next fall.

Special NCAA Committee to Review Playing Rules

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): You recall a year ago at the annual Convention that an amendment was passed that we, in all sports, were

to follow the playing rules as written by the rules committees. In February, the Administrative Committee at the request of the Executive Committee created a special committee to review the playing rules. The committee has done this and has developed guidelines for the rules committees to follow.

All the existing rules established by NCAA sports committees with rules making responsibilities are subject to review by the Special Committee to Review Playing Rules and final approval by the NCAA Executive Committee. Player safety should be the primary consideration of the sports committees in the establishment or modification of playing rules. Committees shall identify the playing rules, ergo, the number of competitors in the contest at any one time, duties of officials, scoring, et cetera; and administrative rules, for example, facilities, specification, number of officials, types of timing equipment governing their sports.

The recommendation is that playing rules may not be altered under any circumstances by competing institutions except for experimentation purposes approved by the sports committees. Administrative rules shall be divided into two categories, those that competing institutions may alter by mutual consent or by exceptions from the sports committee for experimentation purposes, and those that cannot be altered and for which violations would be subject to the Association's enforcement procedure.

The committee shall add appropriate language to rules regarding facilities specification that would embrace the following philosophy: Current and traditionally used facilities should not be required to meet present specifications in the various rules. Any new rule or changes to current rules regarding facility specification shall include sufficient flexibility to allow for current and traditionally used facilities. New and renovated facilities shall meet specifications established in the various playing rules that are current at the time of construction.

Any rules changed that would result in economic impact for either the member institutions or the Association shall be accompanied by an analysis of the cost estimate.

Sports committees shall ensure that penalty procedures to be used by the contest officials or management are included for violations of the playing rules.

As Proposal No. 119, as it was numbered last year, was to be effective on August 1, 1985, the special committee requested that the Council sponsor an amendment at the special Convention held in New Orleans, June 20-21, 1985, to delay the effective date to August 1, 1986, to allow each of the rules committees time to incorporate the guidelines suggested.

Each member of the special committee assumed responsibility of being a resource person for a number of the sports committees if needed. In addition, the NCAA staff representative to each committee has been instructed to assist the committees in following the guidelines. The sports committees will be submitting to the special committee for its review any and all of its actions taken to adhere to the guidelines.

The reason we asked for the year's delay was that many sports committees would not have met by August 1, 1985, and would have been meeting after that and these guidelines would not have been developed and handed over to them.

Ms. Kruczak: Again, it is just another effort to simplify, hopefully, some of our lives. The other committee, we did not hear a report from is the one working on the simplification and deregulation in reference to the Manual. Hopefully by this time next year, there will be a much better index ready; and

once they have the index ready, then the rest of the Manual will fall in place. That committee has been working very, very hard; and Clay Chapman is a member of that committee also. From what we have heard and seen, what they have done, what they have thought about, it certainly is going to be a better Manual very, very shortly.

The other thing I know several of you have asked about is the audit. The audit is going to come to you in the form of guidelines. It is not going to be a sheet with a blank where you fill in this and a blank where you fill in that. It is going to be a set of guidelines for your outside auditor to follow in regard to your intercollegiate athletics program.

It is from the first work draft to the draft they have now. They certainly have taken into consideration and have said many times that they feel that the first drafts would be most difficult for some institutions to complete, but again, please do not feel that your president is going to be receiving a form. He will be receiving guidelines to give to that auditor to bring back to him the information that the NCAA is requiring that he has. Hopefully, it probably will be sometime in April that it will be mailed out. They feel there probably will be another draft.

Here to speak on multidivision classification is A. P. Perkins Jr., president of St. Andrews Presbyterian College, who would like to share some of his thoughts with you.

A. P. Perkins (St. Andrews Presbyterian College): This can be short and sweet. I have learned in 17 years of college administration never to claim to speak for anybody else. It will always end up getting you in trouble, and so I am going to do that right now. But I think I can say based on my four meetings with the steering committee this year that this Steering Committee shares the views that are expressed by some of you in conversation today; namely, that multidivisional classification is something that we probably all would be better off without. The problem that we confront is that we now have multidivisional classification, and so we have to continue to enact legislation to deal with it, to manage it, to make it work as little to our disadvantage as we can.

Long term, I think some of us see a trend developing with the block-grant funding for championships, with the whole federation and with the continuing feeling that many of us in Division III have against multidivisional classifications that we are, indeed, in a trend toward the elimination of that. I think that the best thing that could happen, this is a personal opinion now, not expressing any Council or steering committee view, I think the best thing that could happen to us is that Division II would grow stronger and stronger so that it could attract those from Division I who really ought to be in Division II and those from III who, for a variety of reasons, really ought to be in II.

And so I am hoping that we are going to see, I believe indeed we will see a realignment over the next four, five years; and that block-grant funding and these other things that have been mentioned are indeed a part of a trend that will lead us away from multidivisional classification. It is a complicated question, as we see every time we talk about legislation. That kind of trend that I think I see plus what Will Bailey reported to us the other day on the progress of his Special Committee on Simplification and Deregulation, is about the best news I have heard in my year associated with the NCAA.

Ms. Kruczak: The final topic, block-grant funding and how we see it as affecting our programs commencing in September of this year.

Block-Grant Funding

Judith Sweet (University of California, San Diego): By way of introduction to the block-grant funding, if I may, I would like to borrow from the story that Dr. Whalen shared with us this morning. I feel like I am at the same party that he was at; but beyond the pond of alligators, I see or visualize a den of lions. So the message that I hope to deliver to you is that the block-grant funding presents a lot of unknowns for us at this time.

There will be a committee established that will deal with championship issues for Division III in what we hope will be the most beneficial way possible for all of the membership. We recognize that we are going to have to make some tough calls and some difficult decisions that may not make everyone happy. We are going to ask for your cooperation and your help in defining what it is that can best represent Division III championships.

At this time I would like to call up Bob Shields, who will talk to you about the administrative structure of the block-grant funding. After Bob finishes, what I would like to share with you are some ideas and philosophies that hopefully will stimulate some thought and cause you to react on the direction that you feel the committee should go with this concept.

Robert T. Shields (Fairleigh-Dickinson University, Madison): The block-grant concept is for all intents and purposes basically only a year or so old. Just in the way of a background for those who are either new to the Convention or new to the concept or have not read that much about it in The NCAA News. What started a lot of the thinking relative to the funding of championships was the debacle, if you will, of the TV situation of a couple years ago.

We all moved along for a couple years and got both transportation and in some cases per diem for all of our Division III championships as a result of monies brought in aside from the Division I championships, which principally bring in the most money to the Association. In addition to that were monies that the NCAA gleaned as a percentage from television. When the court case knocked the NCAA out of that TV picture, with it came a deficit.

As a result of that deficit, it was necessary for the Executive Committee (and you must remember that although the Council and your Steering Committee, as a proportion of that Council, can deal with most of the matters of the Association by constitution, it is your Executive Committee that deals with the purse strings) to do something. All decisions relative to how the millions of dollars which the NCAA deals with are spent is the prerogative and the responsibility of the Executive Committee only.

Now, in their deliberations, they had a number of choices. You are all aware of the existing choice: That they eliminate it for 1985 and 1986, paying no transportation money whatsoever to the individual sports.

In 1984 and 1985, in fact, many of us were recipients of a little largess in the mail in the past couple weeks, of per diem money from 1984-85, and certainly if we send anybody if it was an individual sport or a team sport, we got transportation allowance.

Because of that deficit, it was necessary for the Executive Committee to act instantly; and their first act was to eliminate in both Divisions II and III all transportation reimbursement for individual sports. Now, what that precipitated was a discussion of why people should be treated differently, why should a team sport get money and an individual sport not? Proportionately, some of the individual sports were getting a larger share of that dollar than were some of the team sports. So, therefore, that was the easiest way for them to attack

the problem immediately. That was the short-range solution.

Fortunately, in their deliberations and in talking about the long-term solution, they broached the idea of a block grant in which they would give to both Divisions II and III a certain amount of money that they could use for their championships for both transportation and per diem.

Now, remember that the block-grant money has nothing to do with the game expenses. In fact, Bob Riedel this morning mentioned that in addition to the \$1.1 million, although not within the purview of this new committee, but in addition to that, Division III probably will still spend another \$400,000 for game expenses. That is to run the tournaments, has nothing to do with the transportation or per diem, just to run the tournaments.

Now, how are they going to dispense this? Well, it was decided by the Executive Committee that there would be three subcommittees that would deal with the funding pattern for each of the block grants. So that Division III will have a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, who still controls the purse strings, and there will still be some strings attached in terms of regulations. We are all bound by Executive Regulations 1-1, as we went through this morning with Proposal No. 13. But in terms of how that \$1.1 million is distributed, a committee will be formed in February, which will consist of the two individuals that are representing Division III on the Executive Committee. There will be two individuals elected from the steering committee. Of the eleven members on the steering committee, two of those will serve on this championship funding subcommittee, and there will be one at large.

Now, those five people will then deal with that block grant. Now, the block grant we know for 1986-87 is \$1.1 million. We will be notified or that subcommittee of the Council or of the Executive Committee will be notified each August exactly how much money that grant will be. It may never be more than \$1.1 million. But if the resources of the Association are such that if it needs to go down, it may go down.

There are ways in which that can be supplemented. There are also ways in which that \$1.1 million can be made to work well for us; and it is in that area, I think, that Judy wishes to speak.

Questioner: When do you think that we will know how basically it is going to be distributed so we can make budgets for next year?

Mr. Shields: This committee will not be formed until February. It will not have to give its final recommendations until the August Executive Committee meeting, and by then you are almost into your school year. I would suggest that the thing to do is to treat 1986-87 just as you treated 1985-86, and whatever happens is largess or a bonus.

Questioner: When you talk about game expenses that would be added on, are you talking about officials and committees?

Mr. Shields: There is a structure now that whatever it takes to put the tournament on is considered a game expense. It is the participants who are dealing with this \$1.1 million. That is, transportation and/or per diem. That is where the \$1.1 million is; it has nothing to do with actually putting the championship on.

Questioner: How much was spent by the NCAA for the 1984-85 championships for transportation only? Do you have a figure on that?

Ms. Kruczak: How they came up with the \$1.1 million was that they looked at our previous three years, and without the addition of any new championships, that's how they came up with the \$1.1 million. In researching this back, and just

to give you an idea how the transportation expenses for participants were absorbed by the NCAA, 1980-81 \$1,026,425. In 1981-82, there was something different done. The total amount, you have to add it, was \$916,889 plus \$75,539 for football, plus an additional \$3,553 for men's basketball. So again, that looks to be over a million. In 1982-83 it was \$1,004,335. In 1983-84, it was \$1,304,047. In 1984-85, it was \$1,374,799, and that is without two championships, women's soccer and women's lacrosse.

Ms. Sweet: As you can see, the committee has a very challenging task before it. And I would like to reemphasize the fact that we need your help in order to best serve you. The special committee of five people will have to work very closely with the sports committees that have established certain policies for their particular championships and very closely with the Executive Committee and especially closely in my opinion with the members of Division III.

I would like to ask that as I go through some of these areas, that if you feel that they make sense or they do not make sense or they stimulate any other thought, that you jot some of these things down and then you send your thoughts to the Division III steering committee, either your representative or to me or to the NCAA office and it will get to us so we know what you are thinking prior to the time that the committee meets in February. After the February meeting, we will try to get out information to you as quickly as possible so we can keep you informed all through the process.

We had hoped that the committee would be formed earlier. The problem was there was going to be a change in Executive Committee members, there was going to be changes in Council members, and that would mean that people who would be put in place for this committee would be changing after a short period of time. It is unfortunate that that had held us up. We just are going to have to go as far as we can, but we want to do a thorough job.

There is a possibility that things may change from year to year. This is a starting point. And we are going to have to evaluate on an annual basis and determine where adjustments need to be made. So please bear with us. The charge to the committee and the areas that the committee will be exploring are the following: First of all, competition format. Now, under this area, I would like to share with you some thoughts that committee members have received over the course of the year as we have wrestled with the position that we were put in with only team sports being funded and individual sports not being funded and some of the suggestions that we have already received from the membership.

Under competition format, the five-person committee will deal with the number of rounds involved in a championship. We have already heard that some people feel a little bit uncomfortable with four weeks of postseason competition. That is one area that the committee will be exploring.

Secondly, site and number of teams at each site. Is it better to have six sites with four teams or four sites with six teams or 12 sites with two teams? Next, regional play-offs where every team stays in its region versus traditional seeding; where if there were two teams from the same region that had been seeded No. 1 and No. 2, one team might be able to be moved out of the region. Is that a desirable way to go, or does it make more sense to go with regional competition where the regional champions advance to the national championship?

The next item has to do with championship size and qualifying numbers. I have heard some feedback that in some individual sports maybe the

championship has gotten too large. Maybe the standards need to be tightened up a little bit. And as you can see, that means working cooperatively with the sports committees that have established many of the regulations that pertain to how large that field is with the approval of the Executive Committee.

The second area that the committee will deal with pertains to level of transportation and per diem funding. Some of the suggestions that we have received include everyone receiving a percentage of the overall \$1.1 million allocation. A sport would have a set amount of money, and every team that participated would then receive the same percentage allocation. Taking that one step further, another suggestion was that if a sport had an overall allocation, depending upon the distance that your team had to travel, that would influence what your percentage might be.

Another suggestion involved increasing the ground transportation distance limits that currently exist. I believe that currently if a championship is within 250 miles, you have to use ground transportation. The suggestion is to increase that distance to possibly 400 miles or 500 miles, which may result in significant savings for that particular sport.

Another suggestion has been that the institution pay the expenses for the first round of competition. And after the first round, it would be picked up through the block grant. Another suggestion has been that the institution pays the first \$500, or whatever the determined amount is, which would take care of some of the distance inequities; and then the remainder of the money would come from the block-grant allocation.

Another suggestion is that there be a reimbursement based on a per-person, per-mile determination. Another suggestion is to have entry fees for those that participate in the championships. Tied in with this issue is the one that we dealt with this morning in regards to those championships that were initially approved with the understanding that the institution would pay for its expenses in traveling to a championship.

We need some feedback on what that means since the \$1.1 million was based on expenses prior to the time that the membership voted to have an indoor track and field championship, a women's soccer championship, a women's lacrosse championship and the expanded football championship. It is my understanding that there is some discussion on expanding the basketball championship with the first round being paid by the member institution.

Is it desirable to include all sports, even though they were not originally included in that \$1.1 million allocation, or should we abide by the spirit or intent of having the championship and the institutions pay transportation to those particular championships that were voted in without any funding.

The third area that the committee will have to deal with includes location of championships. There will be some flexibility here; and some of the areas that we might like to look at include accessibility of location, weather, exposure for the sport, possibly rotating the sites throughout the country and not imposing that 500-mile radius of percentage of competitors. We also must answer the question of whether we should have predetermined sites or hold the championship on the campus of one of the final-four competing institutions after the final four is determined.

The fourth area that the committee will be looking at is the official traveling-party size. One suggestion has been to reduce the number of individuals that are paid for by the NCAA to include only the athletes, to reduce the travel size that currently is being funded by the NCAA. An example would be volleyball

where only 12 athletes can participate but the travel squad size is 16, which makes it possible to take your trainer, to take the athletics director, a head coach and an assistant coach. Do we want to continue to pay for all of those people?

In individual sports in the past when a team qualified, the coaches were not included in the payment for their travel expenses. That is another issue to be explored.

The fifth area, and this one really deals with philosophy, is the distribution of net receipts. If a sport generates revenue, should that money go back to that sport or should that money go into the general pool to fund all championships?

Those are the five areas that at this point have been designated to fall under the parameters of this special committee. The areas have stimulated for me some related issues that I would like to share with you.

As we explore championships, and I think it is very positive that we are really looking hard at the championship issue, I have heard varying philosophies from total support for the national championships program, to regional championships should be terminal, to Division III should not have championships at all. That pretty much reflects the philosophies or the variance in philosophies that exist within Division III.

As we review these issues, some of these other items to be looked at are championship structure and its effect on missed class time for student-athletes, preserving the quality and integrity of the championship, consistency in policies, potential visibility of the sport and the championship, ease of travel and competitive travel costs, use of any profits generated in specific sports, marketing the championships and seeking sponsorship, having regionals be terminal championships and the required number of institutions for national championships.

There is a proposal that will be voted on tomorrow that allows a championship to continue through 1986-87 even if it does not meet all of the executive regulations while the divisional block-grant committees have an opportunity to start wrestling with some of these issues. One thought was that even if a division did not meet all of the executive regulations, that they may be able to still sponsor that championship using their block grant.

The bottom line of all of this is, that there are lots of questions, we need lots of help. We really need input from you. We have received a couple of good suggestions today, the one that came from John Reeves in regards to track and field and what may happen in the future if there is not a Division I or Division III indoor track and field championship. Also the suggestion that if indoor track and field creates a financial burden with travel costs, perhaps an institution, because of the climatic considerations, might be reimbursed only for either indoor track and field or outdoor track and field, so the same athletes are not paid for twice.

There is any number of questions. Hopefully there will be any number of answers and that you will be able to help us in determining what those answers might be. I would be happy to entertain any questions that you might have right now or if you would just like to give us some suggestions at this point. I believe that the Division III steering committee feels that the championship issue is our No. 1 priority for the next year or two or whatever time it takes to sort this out, so that we can take care of the opportunities for your student-athlete.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): What about the committees and

their expenses and the awards? Will this come out of the block grant?

Ms. Sweet: No. This is only travel expenses for those participating in the championship and the institution's representatives as it currently exists.

Mr. Bogan: I would hope your committee would also consider these divisions playing in Division III. Maybe we can get some money from their division and not take it out of ours.

Ms. Sweet: I think the general consensus is if there is a team playing from a different division, it needs to go back to its division to get some help, that it is going to be hard enough for us to take care of Division III with the \$1.1 million. I cannot say that is going to be the absolute resolution, but it appears from discussions that we have had that that is the general sentiment.

Milton E. Reece (Greensboro College): I have two questions. This \$1.1 million, that is just for Division III?

Ms. Sweet: That is correct.

Mr. Reece: This is from the NCAA Council. What does Division II have?

Ms. Sweet: The same amount, \$1.1 million.

Mr. Reece: The second question, on the revenue-producing sports, the money comes in. Is that going to be a part of the \$1.1 million or is it \$1.1 million plus?

Ms. Sweet: That would be in addition to. But the question that I was suggesting before is that in the past the money generated by a particular sport has gone back to that sport. Is that the way we want to continue to operate or do we want to add that to the pool of \$1.1 million.

Mr. Reece: Could you go back and review for us what is happening in 1985-86? Where do we stand on any kind of reimbursement in 1985-86?

Ms. Sweet: Only team sports will be paid for this year. If you have had any individual teams that have attended championships, you have paid for them; and to the best of my knowledge at this time, there will not be a reimbursement.

William R. Vanderbilt (Hope College): What I was wondering, going back to the \$1.1 million classification or whatever, on what basis was the number of participants ever considered when determining the amount of money that should be given to Division III as compared to Division II?

Ms. Kruczek: As I said, they came up with the \$1.1 million when they took an average of three years. As far as any number of participants, they felt with this block-grant funding that there had been movement, especially on the part of Division II institutions to go up to Division I.

And so, therefore, when they made the allocation of \$1.1 million, same for Divisions II and III, fully realizing Division III has more championships and more participants, they felt that if they made the allocation and gave Division II a little extra, it would stop some institutions from moving up to Division I.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I think that this issue may be another good opportunity for us to send a message to those Division II institutions of our concern of their sending teams down to our Division III championships by informing them ahead of time that our committee will probably be entertaining the very strong possibility that we will not be funding their teams coming down. This may control their willingness to jump into our Division III championships.

Ms. Sweet: I agree with you. The Division III steering committee has discussed that with the Division II steering committee; and, in fact, they understand our position and are not opposed to it. They fully understand and support what that message is.

Ms. Kruczak: The only other things on the pink sheets that was not discussed was financial aid. Again, there is a subcommittee of the steering committee that is coming forth in April with a full report. What we find is that the problems in the Division III financial aid is within the case studies, not within the legislation itself. I also asked staff to prepare a list for the April meeting of the steering committee as to the waivers that have been given to Division III institutions listed under awards of circumstances. Now, again, the legislation is in place. I approved awards as circumstance of the member and so did the steering committee.

Again, it seems more and more is coming in. It seems we are hearing from people that this is where the financial packaging has a great variance from school to school. So what I am saying as far as the financial aid, and I do not know the exact question the person would like to ask, is that it is under study. We have reviewed all the legislation on it. It is in order. It is based on our philosophy, but we find some problems with the case studies. We also would like to review the awards of circumstance.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): One of the things I think that needs to be addressed is the simplification of the student-athlete statement. They were talking about doing something sometime ago, yet nothing has happened there. Now the internal audit has to be done. Also I do not know if it is going to come back to haunt us again, but the affidavits are being piled on us there. I feel we are being flooded with things that really have no bearing on the Division III program. So would you maybe address some of those?

Ms. Kruczak: We certainly agree with you because we, too, have to make them out. The financial aid affidavit is a one-time this-year only. That is for sure. The self-study will be done every five years. As far as the student-athlete statement, coming on the Council back in 1979, that was the first thing on the agenda that I looked at. It is still in there. Again, they do not want to change it or simplify it in any way until they can get it in correspondence with the new way they are going to set up the Manual; and then they feel that is how they are going to make it a much simpler affidavit for our students to sign.

Paul C. Houser (New Jersey Institute of Technology): Where we have Division III people that play in a Division I or Division II championships, that comes out of our block-grant money?

Ms. Sweet: Let me try to answer that question and then answer another question that may be stimulated by it. It is going to be up to the Division I and Division II block-grant committees to determine how they want to deal with that situation. So I think that that committee will have to work closely with Division III in addressing the needs of the Division III membership.

A second question that is somewhat related is what happens if a Division III institution participates in an open championship. That money will not come out of the Division III grant. That will be funded as it always has been, through an open championship funding mechanism.

Ms. Kruczak: Again, it always seems that we would like to sit and talk for a couple more hours; but as you all know, we do have that very important drug education program. At this time I certainly would like to thank you for your time and patience today and certainly look forward to working with your new Council members and your new vice president.

[The Division III Business Session was adjourned at 5 p.m.]

NCAA HONORS LUNCHEON

Monday, January 13, 1986

President Davis: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to our Association's 21st annual honors luncheon. Please remain standing. John Swofford, director of athletics at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, will present our invocation.

John D. Swofford (University of North Carolina): May we pray. Dear Lord, we give you thanks today for the freedom which allows us to come together for fellowship. We offer you our heartfelt thanks for all who have gone before us and for their many accomplishments. Enable us to be thankful for our great inheritance of health, truth and wisdom through our institutions of higher learning. Give us hearts to be thankful for these gifts, open minds to see the need in our world, and the courage to give of ourselves to help those less fortunate than we. We ask your blessings on those gathered here today and on this food that it may nourish us in our service to you. Amen.

President Davis: May I have your attention, please. Mr. Vice-President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have a full agenda facing us, so we need to begin our program at this time. I am aware that some of you still are finishing your lunch. I encourage you to please continue while I make some preliminary observations and introductions before I present our honored guests to you.

Once again, I am pleased to welcome each of you to this occasion. The honors luncheon has become the highlight of the annual Convention. This is one of the times during the year that we focus on the many positive impacts of intercollegiate athletics and one of the very purposes of this Association by a very, very special group of individuals: persons who have been fine students, accomplished athletes and contributing human beings, and who represent thousands of students and graduates of educational institutions across this nation.

During the past year, some of our member institutions, past students and fans have been involved in violation of institutional, conference and NCAA rules as well as accepted rules of ethical conduct. Along with problems associated with drugs and gambling, there are times when it appears indeed that athletics mirror all of the problems of young people in society today. The NCAA believes, however, that rather than being a reflection of society, intercollegiate athletics must represent strong leadership. Through the capabilities of the NCAA, through our member institutions and through examples set by our student-athletes, we certainly will develop the leadership to achieve adherence to sound ethical standard, honest competition and good sportsmanship. We honor that leadership today and the time we spend together now serves as a reminder of the goals and purposes of intercollegiate athletics and of the ability of student-athletes to maximize their potential in all areas of life.

For the first time, the College Athletics Top Ten Selection Committee requested the Administrative Committee to increase the traditional Today's Top Five and Silver Anniversary Awards to recognize six deserving honorees in each category. Herman Fred Russell indicated the emergence of world-class performers in women's athletics the past four years, and the number of quality nominations for Silver Anniversary Awards placed a growing burden on the

committee to select only five individuals from the great number of quality nominations that are received each year.

This request was one of the most enjoyable to which the Administrative Committee responded during the past year. It emphasized to us, and I am sure it will to most of you, that the vast majority of students who do represent and have represented our institutions are individuals in whom all of us take a great deal of pride. I am sure that each of us will leave the room today with the renewed commitment to leadership and resolving mutual problems and providing quality academic and sound athletics opportunities for those who will follow in the footsteps of these outstanding athletes and individuals that we salute here.

At this time, I wish to introduce an individual who has long made significant contributions to this Association, the Southeastern Conference and Auburn University. He has earned the respect of faculty, administrators and coaches as an academician who has maintained a personal commitment to administrators within the framework of higher education. I am fortunate, both personally and professionally, to have had the opportunity to work very closely with our secretary-treasurer during the past year. It is my pleasure to present to you Wilford S. Bailey, faculty athletics representative at Auburn University.

The institutional representative for Grambling State University is a regular participant in NCAA Conventions and a strong advocate of intercollegiate athletics. Its president, Joseph B. Johnson.

Seated to my left is the distinguished and energetic executive director of the NCAA, Walter Byers.

It is a distinct honor for me to present our master of ceremonies to you. He is one of the world's premier journalists, and we are most appreciative that he took time from his demanding schedule to join us today. Tom Brokaw began his successful career in broadcast journalism as morning news editor for KMTV in Omaha, Nebraska, following his graduation from the University of South Dakota in 1962. He moved to WSB in Atlanta in 1965 and a year later began anchoring the evening news for the NBC affiliate in Los Angeles, where, by the way, he covered the first gubernatorial campaign of President Reagan.

He became the network's White House news correspondent in 1973, and held that position until he was named coanchor of the Today show three years later. In 1982, Tom became the New York anchor of NBC Nightly News. He became the sole anchor of NBC's Nightly News the following September, and his credibility with the viewers has continued to increase during the past three years.

Tom travels extensively as a news anchor, covering presidential trips to Europe; the war in Lebanon; the apartheid government of South Africa; the arms negotiation talks between the United States and Russia, and, most recently, President Reagan's historic Geneva summit with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

He is a member of the Reporters Committee on the Freedom of the Press, he is on the North Simon Museum Board of Trustees and is an advisor to the Asian Society. Tom also holds three honorary degrees—from Syracuse University, Washington University in St. Louis and his alma mater, the University of South Dakota. He is also the father of three daughters.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Tom Brokaw.

Tom Brokaw: Thank you all very much. You know, I am very often asked how I got out of South Dakota. Now that you have seen those pictures of me,

I think you have a better understanding. I was asked to leave. (Laughter) We don't want anybody who looks like that around here very long.

I also want to say at the outset that I noticed that the names of the preceding masters of ceremonies of these luncheons the past four years were Cronkite, Musburger, Kuralt and Sawyer. It took CBS four tries and I will try and see if NBC can't get it right the first time around. That is a sense of humor.

I was especially flattered when I was asked to be here and do this today especially when I realized that for \$10,000 and a new convertible you could have had the top running back prospect from SMU for this luncheon. (Laughter) Well, we have to laugh with the pain, ladies and gentlemen, and there are no secrets in your business, nor in mine for that matter.

I am truly honored to be here especially on a dais with these great athletes and the Vice-President. It is a privilege to be with you once again. I was a school-boy athlete, now I am in my middle years still chasing, Walter, my many dreams. But what has remained consistent throughout all that is the scouting report on me. They always write, "Incredibly slow, but he has a weak arm." That much has not changed.

Given my abilities when I was a school-boy athlete, if some colleges had recruited me that alone would have been a violation. (Laughter) It is a great privilege for me to be here today. You have come to this great State of Louisiana, this unique city, and I know you are dealing with some difficult jobs. You are dealing with new problems, new standards, recruiting violations, drugs, gambling. You have come to the right place, ladies and gentlemen. (Laughter)

I truly am honored to be on this dais with the best and brightest of intercollegiate athletics. It is very important to society, and it is very important to me personally.

Before we begin, as a graduate of the University of South Dakota, I also wish to congratulate a fellow member of the North Central Conference, North Dakota State University, for its victory in the NCAA Division II football championship this year. They got that title game by defeating the Coyotes from the University of South Dakota.

It was a painful moment for me when I was an undergraduate there. Times were not so good in terms of intercollegiate athletics, and now they have gotten even better. North Dakota State went on to win. I had to finally acknowledge after having grown up in South Dakota that there was something truly wonderful about the State of South Dakota. I had grown up with the impression that the only good thing to come out of North Dakota was Highway 83, but it is now something else fortunately. (Laughter)

Furthermore, I am happy to be able to represent NBC on this august occasion. My colleagues in NBC Sports are the envy of those in the division. They tell you who won on any given weekend. We tell you who lost nearly every day. The late Earl Warren, who was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, liked to say that he read the sports pages first because it was there that the triumphs of men and women were recorded although the front pages, he explained, is where the failures are documented.

Walter, let me say to you, my friends in NBC Sports said if I get a chance to meet you today I might be able to collect your autograph, but they have a specific piece of paper they would like to have it on. (Laughter) Maybe just the two of us can work this out after the luncheon. (Laughter)

We gathered here today to celebrate the triumphs after what I know has been

another year of triumphs and trials for your organization and for intercollegiate athletics. Education and athletics are primary forces in the organization of our universe, the active mind and the active body. I know how much of my life and the lives of my wife and children have been enriched by our commitment to intellectual and athletic stimulation. I also know that vigilance is required on the part of all of us to be sure that the fundamental values of society are not corrupted or compromised simply because one of these primary forces generates a greater emotional response than the other. The roar of the crowd must not be permitted to cloud our judgment, and that is an obligation of all of us individually and collectively, not just of your organization and your great institutions.

Before I begin to introduce your honorees to you today, I ask that you review in your luncheon program the impressive list of 90 student-athletes who have combined academic and athletic excellence to earn \$2,000 NCAA postgraduate scholarships to continue their education. The Association has invested over \$2 million in assisting 1,649 student-athletes to pursue graduate credit since 1964.

The incoming chair of the NCAA postgraduate scholarship committee is seated to my right. He is Ralph Floyd, director of athletics at Indiana University. (Applause)

At this time may I now call on your secretary-treasurer and my luncheon companion, Mr. Bailey, who has a special presentation.

Secretary-Treasurer Bailey (Auburn University): Thank you, Tom. Vice-President Bush, honorees, ladies and gentlemen, I feel most fortunate that during my involvement in intercollegiate athletics I have had the opportunity to know so many people from the North, South, East and West in our nation. I particularly am honored that I have had the opportunity to observe closely the careers of two football coaches from the South who will be remembered as coaching legends as long as the game of football is played.

A personal friend, the late Paul "Bear" Bryant was recognized at this luncheon in 1982 when he became the winningest coach in the history of college football by surpassing the 314-total victory standard that had been established by Amos Alonzo Stagg.

Today, we salute a man whom Paul Bryant respected as a coach and admired as a friend—one he knew would some day break his impressive record. On October 5, 1985, Eddie Robinson became the winningest coach in the history of college football. Eddie has been the head football coach at Grambling for the past 43 years. His first team won only three games, but his next was undefeated. Only two of his other teams experienced losing seasons over the past four decades. His Grambling teams have won 329 games since he began his career in 1941.

Winning games, however, has not been coach Robinson's only mission. For nearly half a century, he has worked hard to prepare the young men who play for him for a life after athletics. He takes more personal pride in their academic and business successes than in their triumphs on the football field.

It is my distinct privilege to present a special award to the winningest coach in college football history, Mr. Eddie Robinson, the director of athletics and head football coach at Grambling State University.

Edward G. Robinson (Grambling State University): Thank you. I tell you coaching is much easier than being here. Thank you very much, Mr. Bailey, for this very fine introduction, and I am very glad that my best girl is here so I will get better treatment at home when she hears what you said. So I should have

a different role at home. (Laughter)

Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Byers, honorees, President Davis, persons at the dais and this august body of the NCAA, ladies and gentlemen, I think most of you who have heard me could almost guess what I am going to say. When I stand here and tell you that Eddie Robinson has been the luckiest man in the world, I really mean that. I just don't know how so many fine things could really come to one person. Sometimes I question myself as to whether Eddie Robinson deserves all of these fine things.

Mr. Vice-President, I certainly hope that I will see you in person again; because every time I see you in person, some fine things happen to me. The first time I was meeting the President of the United States in Washington; and now today, this possibly could be my greatest moment. I would like to say that this honor you bestow upon me is a great one and that I should have been thought worthy of this recognition by this Association arouses in me mixed emotions of humility and profound gratitude.

Let me say without hesitation that I am proud to be the recipient of your Special Recognition Award of 1986, which is the second time this award has been presented. The first one was presented in 1982 to my late friend coach Bryant, who was one of America's finest coaches and was an inspiration to all of us in the coaching profession. No one, but no one, can be more appreciative of this moment. I am really proud of this moment. I am proud that I have been connected with football, because football was all I had. That is the way it has been. I learned to win, I learned to appreciate what America is all about. I learned to want to be the best American, whatever that is.

I shall include this award among my most valuable possessions as a common heritage handed to me by the NCAA membership, a great organization and the governing body of intercollegiate athletics. I want to thank you and I want to thank your fine leader, Walter Byers, and his staff, for the outstanding leadership you have given to our universities through the years.

I feel that in the future with the great minds we have here in this hall that you are going to handle the drug problems, you are going to handle the recruiting and you are going to handle the academic problems. Today, standing here, this crystallizes one of the highest peaks in my career. I stand here in the full realization, however, that team spirit, hard work, good athletes, good administrators, good coaches, commitments, loyalty and personal sacrifices on the part of my associates through the years made this possible.

I consider this a great honor. My president is Joseph Johnson, and let me tell you how proud I am of him. I read about integrity and all of the things that go along with athletics. One of the things that I am most proud of is that I recruited this man out of New Orleans and I coached him, and he has come back to be our president, and he is a very good president. I consider this honor in a representative capacity to be shared with the players, the coaches, the faculty, the staff and administrators at Grambling and fans who love football all over the world.

Most of all, I am just so pleased for what this honor signifies. I love you and this is indeed a great moment for me. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Brokaw: Coach Robinson, I think it is fair to say that on behalf of all of the people in this room, whatever their achievements, they consider themselves very fortunate, very lucky indeed to have been here for this special moment, not just in athletics but really in American life to honor you.

The College Athletics Top Twelve permits the Association to honor six

outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their Silver Anniversary as college graduates.

The criteria for each of these categories and the members of this select committee are listed in your program. I will begin by introducing the current student-athletes to you.

James M. Dombrowski, University of Virginia, football.

Most college football fans are aware that Jim Dombrowski is one of the nation's premier offensive linemen. He earned consensus all-America honors and twice received all-Atlantic Coast Conference recognition.

A graduate student, who also was the team's captain, Jim is earning a Master's degree in exercise physiology. He had a 3.1 undergraduate grade-point average majoring in biology with a minor in chemistry. He plans to enter medical school and specialize in orthopedic surgery.

Jim probably is best known in the Charlottesville area by people who are not directly associated with the University of Virginia. At 7:00 in the morning, three times each week during football season, this six foot-five inch, 295-pounder administered a volunteer fitness program for senior citizens. He also works with church youth groups and often serves as a chaperone on weekend trips and retreats.

A member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, he spends many hours visiting children at the University Hospital during holiday season.

You will receive this award now from Dick Schultz, the director of athletics at the University of Virginia. (Applause)

Edward D. Eyestone, Brigham Young University, track.

When Ed Eyestone entered Brigham Young University, he was like the typical first-year student. He had participated in high school athletics; and, although he maintained an interest in developing his running skills, he had enrolled without the assistance of an athletics grant-in-aid.

When Ed graduated from BYU four years later, he was anything but typical. He had established a 3.7 grade-point average while pursuing a double major in psychology and secondary education, and he developed his athletic skills to earn two spots on the 1984 United States Olympic team. The winner of five NCAA championships, he captured the triple crown of collegiate distance running with victories in the National Collegiate Division I Cross Country Championships and the 5,000- and 10,000-meter runs in the outdoor championships.

Active in a variety of church-related and civic activities, the NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner served a church mission to Spain and as a volunteer at the Utah State Mental Hospital. Ed, who currently is enrolled in graduate school at BYU, will receive his award from BYU's director of athletics, Mr. Glen Tuckett. (Applause)

Timothy J. Green, Syracuse University, football.

Tim Green may look a bit worn out today. He and Jim Dombrowski have just returned from the Hula Bowl, and they are dealing with jet lag. Most everyone is aware that Tim was named to every all-America football team that was selected in 1985. He is regarded rightly as one of the greatest defensive linemen in eastern football history, and he led Syracuse University to a berth in the Cherry Bowl.

Most people probably do not know that Tim also was the Rhodes Scholar nominee for Syracuse University where he has established a 3.84 grade-point

average majoring in English. His contributions to the university, his ability to assist charitable organizations and his participation in telethons benefitting public television and other charities also deserve to be acknowledged here today.

A National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame and NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, Tim is a member of the athletics policy board and the alumni relations board at Syracuse. He also is an accomplished photographer, and he has received a Kodak medallion for excellence in photography.

Tim will receive his award from Mr. Jake Crouthamel, the Syracuse University director of athletics. (Applause)

Susan K. Harbour, University of Oregon, volleyball. Susan Harbour is establishing an international reputation as one of the world's premier volleyball players, one of the world's most exciting and demanding sports. A four-year starter, who three times has been named her team's most valuable player, Susan this fall became one of the first collegians to earn all-America honors two consecutive seasons.

Susan's success in the classroom has paralleled her achievements on the volleyball court. The academic all-America selection has established a 3.97 grade-point average while pursuing dual majors in mathematics and physical education. A member of Mortar Board honor society, she has devoted considerable personal time to the Special Olympics, the Oregon Games for the Physically Limited and Oregon Achievers.

Susan also is involved in numerous other campus and civic activities, the Campus Crusade for Christ and Athletes in Action. She has served as a counselor, instructor and coordinator for various community and university-sponsored clinics and camps.

Sue will receive her award from Chris Voelz, women's volleyball coach and associate director of athletics at the University of Oregon. (Applause)

Kathryn Lynn Hayes, University of Oregon, track and field.

For the first time since 1975, one institution is represented by two deserving student-athletes in this group of honorees.

Like Sue Harbour, Kathy Hayes represents the University of Oregon. She is also a world-class athlete, and she is considered one of the premier distance runners in the world. A seven-time all-America selection in track and cross country, Kathy established six collegiate records during her career at Oregon. She won the 10,000-meter run at the National Collegiate Division I Women's Outdoor Track and Field Championships and twice placed second in the 5,000-meter run.

Kathy led Oregon to the NCAA outdoor track team title last spring. She also was an important contributor to Oregon's NCAA cross country title as a junior.

An NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, Kathy established a 3.87 grade-point average majoring in biology. The three-time academic all-American has been active in numerous extracurricular activities, and she has been an influential leader in Oregon's Student-Athlete Drug Education Committee.

Bill Byrne, director of athletics at the University of Oregon, will present Kathy her award. (Applause)

Lauri Ann Young, Northeast Louisiana University, track and field.

Lauri Young established herself as one of the nation's top track and field athletes at the 1985 National Collegiate Division I Track and Field Championships by winning the grueling heptathlon championship and placing fourth in

the individual high jump competition.

But her success in the heptathlon—which requires, as you know, expertise in the high jump, long jump, 110-meter low hurdles, 800-meter run, 200-meter run, shot put and javelin—did not come as a surprise to anyone at Northeast Louisiana where she had established school records in the high jump, the javelin and her demanding speciality, the heptathlon. A two-time all-America, the team captain participated for the United States teams that competed against Russia and Canada.

Lauri also is an all-America in the classroom, where she established a 3.69 grade-point average majoring in radio and television. She has offered to race me for my job here today, but I declined. I think the low hurdles are the high jumps in my life at this time.

An NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, she was elected to Phi Kappa Phi and Alpha Lamda Delta honorary societies, among others, and she was listed in Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

Northeast Louisiana University's director of athletics, Benny Hollis, will present Lauri her award. (Applause)

Let me say briefly as the father of three daughters who has watched them have the opportunity for increased participation in athletics, watched them have athletics become an important part of their life, how gratifying and inspiring it is today as well to see among these great male athletes these wonderful women athletes that we are seeing not just here but across the country. Isn't it splendid the way we are doing it? (Applause)

Now responding for the student-athletes is Timothy Green.

Timothy J. Green (Syracuse University): Vice-President Bush, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to extend sincere thanks for the six NCAA has chosen to recognize here today. I believe each of us represents a blend of academic and athletic achievement which speaks to an important American tradition, the tradition of intercollegiate athletics. Each of us is, therefore, greatly honored to accept the NCAA's recognition, and we pledge to do our best to live up to the expectations that it carries.

Despite all the obvious differences there are between the adventures of athletics and scholarships, there are also marked similarities. Both require perseverance; persistence; aggressiveness; energy, and, most of all, the will to improve. I have been very fortunate to have had the chance at Syracuse to enjoy the best of both adventures. In fact, I have found that each experience has complemented the other.

Maybe the best thing about college football and college athletics is that they teach us what Ernest Hemingway called grace under pressure. They reinforce the idea that through considerable effort and self-discipline you can learn to be graceful and effective.

Scholarship, it turns out, teaches us the same things by taking our considerable God-given gifts and applying them. This is the promise of success in those things we end up doing in the future. We will strive through that with the same vigor that has resulted in our being here today.

To our teachers, our coaches, our universities, we owe a great debt. Instruction, encouragement, criticism, winning and losing has forged us into what we are today. It is soon to be our turn to repay that debt by providing a positive example for others to follow. I love football and I love scholarship, and I thank God I have been given the gifts I have to excel at both.

For all of us here today, please know that we consider being named NCAA's

Top Six Scholars as an unequal honor. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Brokaw: Now, we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees, my generation more or less.

Robert L. Lilly, Texas Christian University, football.

Bob, I can't tell you how glad I was to see you with those half-frame glasses on as you were sitting down there. Universally acclaimed as one of the outstanding football linemen of all time on any level of competition, Bob Lilly twice earned all-America honors at TCU and was elected to the all-time Southwest Athletic Conference "Dream Team."

He also played, as we all know, 14 seasons in the National Football League for the Dallas Cowboys where he was named an All-Pro Defensive Tackle seven times and selected to appear in 11 All-Star Games. A member of the National Football Foundation, Professional Football and Texas Sports Writers Hall of Fame, Bob was the first player inducted into the Texas Stadium Ring of Honor, which included the retiring of his jersey number and placement of his name and number on the inside rim of that stadium's upper deck.

Just as he was active in a number of campus activities at TCU, including the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and Big Brothers Association, Bob has established a reputation as a great humanitarian by all who know him. Three years ago, Bob owned one of the most highly profitable beer distributorships in the state of Texas. Then one night, while driving back to his home from an out-of-town trip, he was the first person to arrive at a traffic accident. He saw teenagers, some bleeding from cuts, inside an overturned truck. When he opened the door to assist the injured passengers, beer cans fell out. Within 48 hours, Bob had sold the distributorship and had begun a new career in real estate investments and land development in New Mexico.

Bob has participated in numerous charitable fund-raising activities in Texas, in Dallas and for TCU, and in 1983 was recognized by his alma mater for distinguishing himself in business and social activities.

Bob will receive his award from TCU's athletics director, Frank Windeger. (Applause)

Frank E. McKinney, Jr., Indiana University, swimming.

Success has been a constant companion for Frank McKinney. It has been with him from the time he established himself as a world-class swimmer at Indiana University to his selection as the chief executive officer for the American Fletcher National Bank in Indianapolis.

Frank won three Olympic medals with a gold and silver in 1960 and a bronze in 1956. He also was a two-time NCAA individual champion, winning both the 100- and 200-yard backstrokes and swimming on the first-place 400-meter relay team. Frank set three world swimming records and was selected the Outstanding Male Swimmer in the United States in 1959.

A member of Blue Key and Sphinx Club, he was president of the Indiana University Student Foundation. Frank is president and CEO at American Fletcher National Bank, and currently serves as vice-chairman of the Board of Allied Bank International in New York City and on the Board of Directors of numerous entities, including Indiana Bell Telephone, Indianapolis Power & Light Company, and the Association of Bank Holding Companies. He also is an active member of the executive committee of board of directors for numerous professional and civic organizations, including the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Indiana State Symphony Society, the Indiana Newman

Foundation, State Chamber of Commerce, and the International Institute of Sports, Science and Medicine.

Frank serves on the University of Notre Dame College Administration Advisory Council; and he has served on the Board of Regents for Butler University, Indiana University and Franklin College.

He remains active in the United States Olympic Committee and has been inducted into both the International Swimming and Indiana University Halls of Fame.

He will receive his award from Indiana University president, John W. Ryan.
Claude T. Moorman II, Duke University, football and track.

Had the Today's Top Five Award been a reality in 1961, there is little doubt that "T" Moorman would have received the recognition 25 years ago.

An all-America end who ranked second nationally in pass receiving and set an Atlantic Coast Conference record for receptions in one game, "T's" touchdown reception led Duke University to a 7-6 victory over the University of Arkansas in the Cotton Bowl.

The track letterman also was president of the senior class. He was elected to Omicron Delta Kappa and Beta Omega Sigma honoraries, among others; and he was named to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

Claude's pace has not declined since he graduated from Duke. He bypassed opportunities to participate in professional football and immediately began training for a career in medicine. Following a surgical internship at Duke, he became an anesthesiology resident at Walter Reed Army Hospital and became the Chief of Anesthesia Services at Hunter Air Field. He joined the Emory University Hospital staff and then spent two years as a volunteer physician in Vietnam. Listen to this. Upon his return, he briefly practiced in Virginia and then began to pursue a law degree at the College of William and Mary. Since then, he has been admitted to the bar in three states and the District of Columbia. If he gets sued for malpractice as a doctor, he can defend himself. (Laughter)

"T" reentered the Army to serve two years with the legal department of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology before returning to his anesthesiology practice. He currently is Chief of Anesthesiology at Fort St. Lucie, Florida, Hospital. The founder of Treasure Coast Anesthesiologists Associates, "T" is a fellow of the American College of Legal Medicine.

"T" will receive his award from Tom Butters, Duke University's director of athletics. (Applause)

Jack W. Nicklaus, Ohio State University, golf.

Jack Nicklaus obviously is one of America's most recognized personalities. Even those few who may not know him by name are aware that he regularly appears on weekend television either chasing a little white ball on carefully manicured grass or appearing in commercials. I think I saw him on television when Zoeller was giving him a wet kiss, but we will not go into that.

By any account, Jack Nicklaus is perhaps the world's most outstanding professional golfer. He has won 19 major tournaments, including four U.S. Open titles—the first in his rookie season—the Professional Golf Association and the coveted Master's five times each, and the British Open three times. Jack joined the professional golf tour in 1961, following his victory in the NCAA championships. He also won his second United States amateur title that year. Jack won his first at age 19.

Many people do not know that Jack is the active president of Golden Bear, Incorporated, which operates a variety of businesses under one corporate title. His golf-course design campaign currently has 37 courses open for play and 22 more under contract throughout the world.

When one becomes familiar with Jack's contributions to society, it is difficult to understand how he finds time to maintain his competitive golf schedule or oversee his expanding business. For example, he has helped raise more than \$1 million for Children's Hospital in Columbus, Ohio, among other charities, and has served on several boards of directors, including the National Advisory Council of No Greater Love, which sponsors programs for children of servicemen missing in action or killed in action, hospitalized veterans and older Americans, and the National Committee of Americans for Clean Air and Water. He is also the annual host of the Memorial Tournament.

Jack has been presented honorary doctorate degrees by both Ohio State University and the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, and he has established the L. Charles Nicklaus Golf Scholarship Fund and a scholarship for the law school at Ohio State.

Jack will receive his award from Mr. Rick Bay, director of athletics at Ohio State. (Applause)

Kenneth A. Shaw, Illinois State University, basketball

In 18 days, Ken Shaw will accept another professional challenge that will enhance his stature as one of the nation's emerging young leaders in higher education. On February 1, he officially takes office as the president of the University of Wisconsin system.

He began his career by serving five years as a teacher, counselor and coach in Park Forest, Illinois, before becoming an instructor in education and a Residence Hall Director at Illinois State University in 1966. He remained at his alma mater for three years before being named vice-president and dean of Towson State University in 1969.

He became president of the Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, campus in 1977 and two years later was named the first chancellor of the Southern Illinois University system, where he has served the past six years.

Ken is active in numerous professional and civic organizations. I will list only a few of them. He is active in both the American Council on Education and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, public commissions such as the Illinois Council on Economic Education, and numerous community-oriented organizations in the Bloomington and Normal area. He was recently named the Southern Illinois, Incorporated, Citizen of the Year and received the Phi Delta Kappa Young Leader in Education award.

A member of the Illinois Basketball Hall of Fame, Ken, or should I say Buzz, was an outstanding player at Illinois State. He earned all-Illinois Intercollegiate Athletic Conference recognition and remains number eight in career scoring at Illinois State. Twice the team captain, he also was president of the University Club, which was the leading campus service organization for men.

Ken will receive his award from Illinois State University's director of athletics, Robert E. Frederick. (Applause)

Francis A. Tarkenton, University of Georgia, football

Fran Tarkenton's career has blossomed in so many different areas that he may be more easily recognized as a television entertainment personality than one of the most exciting quarterbacks who ever participated in the game. Now,

that's incredible.

Fran earned all-America recognition at Georgia as a quarterback and, more importantly, as a student. He earned all-Southeastern Conference honors three times and led the SEC in both passing and total offense. He also established a conference passing record, completing 60.8 percent of his attempts. The team captain started the Georgia Chapter of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and he received the highest award presented to a student when he was inducted into the Gridiron Secret Society.

Following his graduation, Fran played 18 seasons in the National Football League and set numerous NFL records, leading Minnesota to three Super Bowl appearances. He passed for 47,003 yards and threw 342 touchdown passes for both the Vikings and the New York Giants, both of whom could have used him this year. He continues to hold several NFL records, which include passing for more than 1,000 yards in 18 consecutive seasons.

Fran now owns a variety of successful businesses, including an international management consulting firm, a multimillion dollar computer software company and a marketing and advertising firm. But the public may best know Fran for his success in the entertainment field, where he became one of three permanent hosts for the highly successful *That's Incredible* show.

Fran is past-chairman of the Capital Gifts Campaign for a children's hospital, and currently serves as the chair of the University of Georgia Bicentennial Capital Funds Campaign. He recently was selected as Georgia Young Man of the Year.

Fran will receive his award from the University of Georgia's director of athletics and head football coach, Vince Dooley. (Applause)

I want to tell you one of the nicest things about growing up and doing what I am doing is I get to be with all of my heroes of my generation and my boyhood heroes as well. To respond on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is Jack Nicklaus.

Jack Nicklaus (Ohio State University): Thank you, Tom and Rick. Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Davis, fellow honorees, ladies and gentlemen, I am having a little trouble explaining a 25-year anniversary here and still remaining 39 years old. (Laughter) I guess that is life, though. Anyway, I wish to thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here today to respond on behalf of the other honorees. I am sure that there are a lot of them that you would rather have up here than me, and certainly far more qualified to speak for this honor.

However, on behalf of Bob, Fran, Buzz, "T", Frank and myself, I just want to say a few words of thanks 25 years later for the guidance our college experiences have given to us. I know they were some of the hardest and some of the best years of our lives, but certainly ones that we will cherish forever.

As I look back 29 years and think about the decision as to which college to attend and for what reason, that decision scares me a little bit today. My whole life was determined by that decision. I am sure the other five gentlemen here honored had similar hard decisions to make. What school do I attend? What was I going to do in life? Will I be successful? Can I really make it?

Well, these are obviously the same decisions that thousands of young people face every year. I know from the experience of a father of three who have just gone to college by the scholarship route, it wasn't easy. I fortunately chose a good school, Ohio State University. That decision was not based on golf. That decision really was based on the fact that I really wanted to go to Ohio State. I had not missed an Ohio State football game from the time I was six years old

until the time I got out of school. Of course, that was before the days when it was nine to three every year. (Laughter)

I not only had a great experience in training at Ohio State, not only from the academic side but also from a super golf coach and person, a gentleman named Bob Kepler. Bob was a great guy. He taught me many things about life. The most important was discipline and sportsmanship, and there are more important things in life than just playing golf. I am sure the other honorees had similar experiences that certainly helped them to mold a balanced life.

This, along with a great mother and father, has meant more to me in life than anything I can recall. We all had great collegiate experiences; and now, 25 years later, it is a great honor to receive this NCAA Silver Anniversary Award. On behalf of the six of us, I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Brokaw: Thank you, Jack. Now it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of today's program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

If you will open your program, you will see pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen of national reputation and outstanding accomplishments who, having earned a varsity athletic award in college, has by a continuing interest and concern for physical fitness and competitive sports and by personal example exemplified most clearly and forcefully the ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former Presidents of the United States, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine, and educators. All truly have been worthy of the recognition.

We salute today another former student-athlete who has devoted his life to public service. He has made significant contributions in congressional and executive leadership positions and has had a significant role in the development of this nation's policies for national and international affairs.

Our honoree long has made serving his country one of his top priorities in life. He became the youngest commissioned pilot in the United States Navy at the age of 18 and served three years as a carrier pilot fighting in the Pacific theater.

He flew 58 combat missions and was awarded three Air Medals. On his final mission, his plane was hit by antiaircraft fire. He completed his assignment, bombing a Japanese radio installation, in a crippled and burning plane before heading back out over the water to bail out. Vice-President George Bush parachuted into the water, where he was rescued by a submarine after a fellow pilot kept a Japanese boat away from him. For his last mission, he was presented the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Upon the completion of his tour of duty, he entered Yale University. As team captain and first baseman, he played in the first College World Series, leading Yale to consecutive second-place finishes in the first two National Collegiate Baseball Championships. He earned Phi Beta Kappa honors majoring in economics.

Following his graduation, he entered the oil-development field and cofounded a firm that pioneered experimental off-shore drilling equipment that today is responsible for much of the energy produced around the world.

His political career began when he was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1966 from Texas' Seventh District. He was reelected without opposition.

He was appointed the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. He served as the chairman of the Republican National Committee for two years. He was named the chief of the United States Liaison Office in the People's Republic of China in the early stages of our reopening of the relations with that great country.

He was appointed director of the Central Intelligence Agency, where he helped write the executive order that guaranteed the protection of civil rights of United States citizens. He remains chair of the Task Force on Terrorism and coordinates the nation's activities to combat international terrorism. He remains as well a competitive and tenacious athlete, running regularly. He has a tennis game scheduled this afternoon. And it is widely believed he is running to stay in shape for the Republican presidential nomination in 1988. It could be one of the most interesting match-ups that year, the Yale first baseman against the Buffalo Bills quarterback, we all expect. (Laughter)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a great sense of pride and it is a privilege as well personally, that I present to you the 43rd Vice-President of the United States, a great and decent man, George Bush.

President Davis: Mr. Vice-President, recognizing your superb undergraduate career as a student and athlete, and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, I am pleased to present to you the 1986 Theodore Roosevelt Award in recognition of your many contributions to this nation in congressional and executive leadership positions, including your service as its 43rd Vice-President.

Vice-President Bush: Thank you, Jack, very much, and, Tom, for the generous introduction. Let me say how pleased I am to be here, and I want to pay my respect to Walter Byers and to Jack and everybody that makes this marvelous organization tick. I am very pleased to be sitting next to my own athletics director, a household word in sports, Frank Ryan. I am proud to salute the Silver Anniversary Six and also the more current model over here, and also to Eddie Robinson, the special honoree of the day. I am very, very proud to be in his company. My wife considers me an unremitting, boring name dropper. Wait until I get home after this luncheon.

You all know the story about the kid dragging his mongrel dog across town with a big rope on his neck, taking him over to the Westminster Pet Show. They said, "Do you think he is going to win anything?" He said, "No, but he is going to be in some damn fine company."

So here I am, good field, no hit. I was a baseball player in college, and we had some ups and downs as a team. A big up was playing two years in a row in the finals of that College World Series, once against University of Southern California and once against California, '47 and '48. That was the up. The down was in the final game of the second series against the University of California. We were playing and we were one and one, I believe, with two outs of the series. My coach was Ethan Allen, as many of you remember. Ethan, brilliant strategist, walked the eighth batter to get to the pitcher. Jackie Jensen was pitching. It is the gospel truth. He hit a ball that is still rolling out there. He was a great philosopher.

Another sports figure, Yogi Berra, said that you can observe a lot by watching. One of the things I observed as I watched Jensen's ball sail out of that Kalamazoo ball park was I gave up on winning; but I heard what Jack said. It was discipline and sportsmanship. I like to think also that in sports there are friendships. For 80 years, the NCAA competitions really have been teaching

these lessons and other lessons to kids like hard work, winning spirit and family.

I remember what it meant when my mother and father would come up and watch sports, whether it was in school, high school level, college or whatever. Having become a father and now a grandfather since, I have an idea what that means. I would say that it is important to family. Speaking of family, please, NCAA, keep up your battle against drugs in sports and keep up your battle for academic excellence that has been so beautifully represented here today. Teamwork, sportsmanship, trying hard, working hard, self-confidence, love of family, these are the lessons of sports.

I also happen to believe they are lessons of a lifetime. They are lessons that have been a part of American education for more than two centuries, and the young Americans must adhere to them if freedom and democracy are to stay strong and we are to set an example for the rest of the world. Tomorrow morning I leave for Guatemala to salute that country's recent free election and their major step down the path to democracy. It is indeed an honor to represent the United States abroad. It is the most free, most unselfish and honorable country in the world and, gentlemen, the most competitive.

This award is named for Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt preached the doctrine of strenuous life. By that he meant the life of competition, the life of vigorously being a part of your time and place. Well, I think the doctrine of strenuous life is the doctrine of all of us in this room and particularly the doctrine of the athletes that we honor, the Silver Anniversary and Today's Top Six honorees.

I am very, very proud to have been invited here. Thank you for this honor. It means a great deal more to me than I can every tell you. Thank you very, very much. (Applause)

President Davis: Thank you, Mr. Vice-President. Now, I am pleased to present the institutional plaque to the director of athletics of Yale University, Frank Ryan. This plaque commemorates the selection of one of the university's distinguished alumni as the recipient of the 1986 Theodore Roosevelt Award.

Mr. Brokaw: That concludes what has been for me personally an exhilarating afternoon. I know for all the honorees this is a moment that they will long remember, and I know we will long remember sharing it with them today. I would like to thank the NCAA and all of you as well for asking me to participate in this program, thus helping celebrate the accomplishments of those that honor their schools, their sports, their communities and themselves by demonstrating that their achievements cannot be confined merely to the athletics arena. We know that great athletes honor a place of great privilege in our society; and it is an enduring lesson for all of us, it seems to me, when they use that privilege not simply for their own enrichment but for the greater common good.

We know these men and women as athletes. That will be the conspicuous identification of their legacy. But isn't it important as well to know them as citizens who want to be remembered for more than how fast they ran or swam, or how far or how accurately they threw or struck a ball, or each other? It is simply a lesson in excellence for all of us, it seems to me. Their lives are modeled for all of us individually and collectively. They have set a very high standard, but let them be the standard by which education and athletics should be judged and not the exception.

Finally, let me say to all of you I know you have important business before

you this week and tough decisions to make, but I have one simple plea. I hope whatever you do that you do not establish minimum SAT scores for anchormen. Thank you very much. (Applause)

President Davis: Thank you, Tom, for sharing the day with us. As token of our appreciation for your serving us so ably today and to remind you of the admiration and respect our Association holds for you, I am pleased to present this serving set to you. If you will please rise, John Swofford will offer the benediction.

John Swofford (University of North Carolina): May we pray. Dear God, as we leave today, may your wisdom guide our working games so that we may grow in the love of all that is true and honest and have good rapport. When we go out into the world may we carry with us the highest of ideals and as we go our separate ways may we go in peace. Amen.

GENERAL BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Morning Session, January 14, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with President Davis presiding.

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

[*Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and general committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.*]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

[*Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.*]

Louise Albrecht (Southern Connecticut State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 1 and 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal Nos. 1 and 2 (Pages A-1 and A-2) were approved.]

Consent Package—Bylaws, Others

Elmer W. Yoest (Otterbein College): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal Nos. 3 through 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

[A request to remove Proposal No. 13 was made.]

[Proposal Nos. 3 through 12 (Pages A-2 through A-7) were approved.]

Leanne Grotke (California State University, Fullerton): On behalf of the Council and the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Judith Sweat (University of California, San Diego): I move to refer action on Proposal No. 13 to the Council and the Executive Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to speak as to why the motion is made to refer back to the Council and the Executive Committee. There has been some confusion on what the impact of this proposal might really have on the new concept of the block-grant funding. Consequently, since there are many sports that will be affected by it during the next year or two, we feel that we need more time to really evaluate what the impact may be. We would like to ask the support of the Convention on this proposal to refer.

[Proposal No. 13 (Page A-7) was referred to the Council and Executive Committee.]

Eligibility of Student Athletes

Jeffrey R. Holland (Brigham Young University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, of which I am a member, and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Presidents Commission and the Council support this proposal, a proposal intended to convey and affirm that student-athletes as well as the coaching staff are responsible for their involvement in violation of NCAA regulations and should be restored to eligibility only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration.

In consideration of this responsibility for compliance, the Commission and the Council also believe that a standard of conduct should be applied similar to the standards defined in the recent special Convention that distinguished between major and secondary violations. When a student-athlete is involved in the receipt if a major recruiting inducement or extra benefit, that student-athlete should be held accountable for such involvement; and eligibility should not be restored unless special mitigating circumstances indicate the restoration of eligibility clearly is warranted.

Now, the Commission and the Council feel that unless student-athletes are made aware that their own involvement in violations may result in significant sanctions against them, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve the compliance expected by the member institutions in this Association. The proposal is not intended to result in any undue hardship or unfair sanctions upon a student.

It is stipulated in the proposal that relief can be granted, even in serious cases, when mitigating factors exist. However, fresh in our memories is the recent example of the young man who thought he was in compliance by taking money directly from the regents rather than through the booster club. The adoption of this proposal will serve to clear up the confusion that that young man faced.

Milton R. Schroeder (Arizona State University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 19-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last June, the Association made a major commitment to a strengthened enforcement program. This amendment that the conference is offering is offered in the spirit of support for that commitment. We offer the amendment because of serious concern that the directive to restore eligibility in cases of major violations only in unique cases may be counterproductive to the Association's goal of an effective enforcement program. The enforcement program needs the cooperation of student-athletes who are willing to testify about infractions of which they are aware and in which they may be involved. It needs the cooperation of our member institutions, active cooperation, to encourage the athletes to so testify. A policy of the Association that makes athletes who are involved in infractions subject to serious eligibility consequences, even in the instances where there are institutions that may have cooperated, may create the risk of making it much more difficult to obtain the information necessary for an effective overall enforcement program.

Already the fear of loss of eligibility is a deterrent to many athletes to cooperate. We fear that this risk may increase if there is not sufficient flexibility in those who are called upon to do so to take into account those individuals and institutions who are cooperative. Likewise, from an institutional standpoint,

institutions that might otherwise be willing to acknowledge institutional responsibility for violations, when the eligibility consequences for their student-athletes become very serious, may decide that their responsibility to their students may require their taking a more adversarial posture during the enforcement process, protracting that process and making it more difficult to have the effective enforcement program we want.

If these developments occur, the support of the membership for the cooperative principle in enforcement may be taxed even further as athletes and students who have acted promptly and forthrightly see a growing disparity in treatment when their actions are compared with those who have the aid in a less forthright and perhaps more adversarial vein. We believe these concerns are not imaginary. We have already had instances where the committee has had to reconsider its institutional penalties to take into account eligibility consequences in the instance of individuals who otherwise had been cooperative during the enforcement process.

Finally, we believe that the amendment that has been offered does no damage to the main intent of this proposal, which is to make certain that athletes who are involved in willful and deliberate violations and are not cooperative have serious consequences. But we do believe that it is important to protect the judgment and discretion of the Association to make sure that the overall enforcement program is effective.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I rise to speak in opposition to this amendment because, first of all, I think it takes the guts out of what we are attempting to say to the student-athletes of this country that for once and for all the NCAA is going to stand tough, particularly against the major violations. I have talked to the NCAA enforcement people as a representative of a conference that has long had an ongoing discussion with the NCAA over this concern. There is no concern by the enforcement branch of the NCAA concerning this. We were given a clear message at the June Convention to take a tough stand for the athlete who certainly is involved in a major violation, and for once and for all we should not water it down. We should send the message that if an individual violates this, he is going to pay the price.

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): I would also like to speak in opposition to this amendment. It is the feeling of the Council that it does water the amendment down. We need to get the message to the student-athlete the same as we have to the institutions and the staff members of the importance of the integrity of the recruiting process.

Olav B. Kollenvoll (Lafayette College): The Eligibility Committee also feels that watering down the penalties that might be imposed also tells the student-athlete out there that maybe it is all right to take a hand-out there because they only are going to get slapped. I feel that is the wrong attitude to take.

[Proposal No. 19-1 (Page A-12) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-11) was approved.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the special Convention in June, the Commission and the Council sponsored a resolution calling for sponsorship of this legislative proposal at this Convention. That resolution was resoundingly approved by a vote of 429 in

favor with only three votes opposed. We assumed, therefore, that this is the type of legislation that the membership wants.

The problem, as was explained in June, is that a growing number of institutions are playing 35 to 40 basketball games in a season, well over the limit of 28 regular-season games. Generally, they are doing that by taking advantage of the several opportunities for basketball games that as of the present time do not count against the limit. For example, one game against the club team, or one against the foreign team traveling in the United States, or at the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic, or in the preseason NIT or in Alaska or Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or a foreign tour. As you can see, there are quite a few opportunities. What this proposal does is limit each institution's team to only one of those opportunities in a year. If you play in the Alaska tournament, you cannot do any of the others that year. If you take a foreign tour, that is for the year. The year would run from the start of the academic year in the fall to the same date one year later. The point is to further control the ever-expanding sports seasons as the presidents and the NCAA membership have so convincingly requested.

Robert W. Sankey (University of Arizona): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This modification to Proposal No. 20 is simple in its intent. It would exempt one basketball game against the foreign team playing in the United States from the overall one-game exemption proposed in Amendment 20. To put it differently, it would continue to allow your basketball teams to play one basketball game against a foreign team in the United States without counting it against the season game limit irrespective of whether or not your team had played a club team of the Amateur Basketball Association, a team in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and so forth.

I urge your support of the amendment to the amendment with the following thoughts in mind. First, it is not contrary to the spirit of the Presidents Commission's concern for limiting contests in that these games are invariably home games without the attendant harm of travel time and missed class time. Further, they are well within the current basketball season for practice and thus do not extend player involvement.

Secondly, this type of contest has the unique and special benefits of encouraging international cooperation and good will in addition to supporting the international nature of the support and thus deserves special encouragement through the currently granted exemption from the regularly scheduled limits. Finally, this special exemption is needed because opportunities to host foreign teams often come rather late in the scheduling process; and thus the opportunity to add such games to the playing schedule as a noncounting contest is essential. Certainly, the Pac-10 is concerned and supports the limitation on basketball contests; but we feel that the harms for this amendment are so small and the benefits are so great on an international scale, that we ought to facilitate and encourage foreign teams to come to the United States to play.

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chair, I am all for international understanding, but I am afraid that I would have to regard this proposed amendment to the amendment as a watering down of the basic Proposal No. 20. I would urge your no vote on it.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Mr. President, I do not believe that this amendment is watering down to any degree whatsoever the basic spirit and

intent of the Presidents Commission's proposal. As past president of ABA-USA for the past four years, the permissiveness of being able to play an international team not only promoted a good amount of good will but it was a great assist for us winning two Olympic gold medals.

[Proposal No. 20-1 (Page A-13) was approved by all divisions.]

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the Pac-10 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20-2.

Again, you schedule your domestic schedule before most of these opportunities come to you through our international basketball channels. We wanted to offer the Convention the opportunity to continue the summer competition, which again is not in the area where we believe the presidents intended to restrict, that is, your normal regular-season schedule.

[Proposal No. 20-2 (Page A-14) failed in all three divisions.]

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): We have the great Alaska Shoot-Out, and we are in agreement with Proposal No. 20 as far as the tournament is concerned with the extra games and playing in Hawaii and teams that come to visit us. What we are concerned with is that during the normal season we have teams visiting us in Alaska and playing four contests. Usually they are playing two against the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, and two games at the University of Alaska, Anchorage. We have difficulty scheduling in Alaska, and we think this proposal hurts because we are only allowed institutions to come and play against us and count one of those games. Right now, you come up and we do not have to count those games. In this particular proposal, especially for the Division II teams or any Division I team that plays basketball, men and women, those games would now count. They usually only come up one or two years. We believe counting the one contest rule is a detriment to our program. We are not against the Presidents Commission in preventing universities from playing in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska; but we would urge especially in Division II to vote against this.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-12) was approved as amended by No. 20-1].

Resolution: Enforcement and Compliance

Ira Michael Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 21 on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the special Convention last June, a resolution was submitted instructing the Council to prepare a set of enforcement procedures that accorded with the principles that were stated in that resolution. That legislation was referred to the Presidents Commission and to the Council. We in turn have asked the Committee on Infractions to assess and advise and to experiment as the new compliance service comes into being and as the Association goes forward with secondary and major violation cases. This motion before you reiterates that request and directs the Council and the Commission to consider further changes of proposed legislation, if necessary, to next year's Convention. In other words, we on the Commission and on the Council have concluded that we need more experience, more observation, more experimentation before we should go about legislatively to change the procedures that are contained in the NCAA Rules.

[Proposal No. 21 (Page A-14) was approved.]

Financial Aid Limitation

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 22 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the referral of Proposal No. 22 to the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council so that both groups may study the several issues cited herein and announce to the membership the legislation, if any, that one or both may propose in this regard for consideration at the 1987 NCAA Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of the motion to refer Proposal No. 22. I have consistently supported efforts to take financial aid out of the constitution so that Division I and Division II may vote separately on it. But there are some questions regarding this proposal that I think could best be resolved through referring it and letting the Council and the Presidents Commission look at it.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-15) was referred to the Council and Presidents Commission. Later, a motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Financial Aid — Pell Grants

L.O. Morgan (University of Texas, Austin): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent of this motion is apparent, and I will not spend any time talking about it, but I will just urge your support.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): The history of this amendment is certainly not necessary to this Convention. We moved from zero exemptions to \$900 over the last three years. Did you ever try to explain to a student or staff member at your university, or somebody outside of your campus, the Pell Grant exception? If you have, you sound like "Professor Backwards." You tell the students what they have done is applied for this money from the Federal government which they have received, and then we allow them to keep \$900. It is incredible.

What you see is not what you get, and what we have done is something that is eminently unfair for our athletes. Our book is full of prohibitions, things we cannot do, things that our athletes cannot do. This is one of the rare chances that we have to do something positive and allow our athletes a benefit. It has been said that we have to worry about extra benefits. The NCAA book is full of concerns about extra benefits. In this case, we are not treating our athletes better than our students, but rather worse. This is a rare chance to do something in a positive sense for athletes who applied for this money, who need this money, who deserve this money. What we are doing by taking their money and applying it against their own scholarship makes the sting look like the Salvation Army. These athletes, as we have seen in the last few years in the recruiting problems, these athletes are in financial need and here is an opportunity to benefit the athletes without giving illegal inducement or hurting the recruiting program.

Asa N. Green (Livingston College): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 23. As the gentleman pointed out, we increased the exemption on the Pell Grants from three years ago. This proposal would totally exempt it. What we are talking about is the potential for giving student-athletes the Pell Grant on top of a full athletic grant-in-aid, whatever that might be at our respective institutions.

There are philosophical questions that have led me consistently to oppose the accepting of any part of the Pell Grant, because it does come on top of the full grant-in-aid. But more importantly in Division II, which has no revenue-producing sports except in very, very rare situations at individual institutions, this will be an enormous cost burden on Division II. I would urge the Division II delegates to vote against it and hope that our friends in Division III might join us.

John J. Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): I would like to speak in favor of this proposed amendment. As Doug Weaver has indicated in his comments, it is important to recognize that the money we are talking about here comes from the Federal government and the Federal government has long recognized that to cover room, board and tuition for needy students is not sufficient particularly in this day and age.

Let me give you an example or two. Let us suppose in some hypothetical university that room, board and tuition is \$5,000, and under the Federal government's review and the university's review it is determined, and believe me this is watched very closely, that a student could qualify for an additional \$1,900 over and above the \$5,000 for room, board and tuition to cover such things as a little bit of travel back and forth at the beginning and ending of each semester, laundry money and things of that nature.

Anyone who has a child in college at the present time knows that something like \$1,900 for those kinds of additional expenses is very, very minimal. So what happens, we currently would give them \$900 of that. The institutions in effect would take the \$1,000 and apply it towards the \$5,000 room, board and tuition and reduce their contribution to the student by \$1,000. We only have to pay \$4,000 on a partial grant where the student would qualify for \$1,000, they could use the whole \$1,000 to pay their part of it. So it is important to recognize that you are not taking anything away from the individual student from the institution. The Federal government is paying for this. It only goes to those needy students.

Mr. Green (Livingston College): We obviously disagree on the premise of whether or not we are taking things away from the institution. As a president who has analyzed this carefully, I feel it is going to cost my institution money. I want to address the point that there is a feeling on the part of some delegates and many people that the Pell Grants are an entitlement. They are not an entitlement. They are a need-based financial aid program, although they are commonly referred to as an entitlement. The other part of the problem is that in my judgment if we exempt and even increase the exemption, much less total exempt the Pell Grant from the financial aid limits, we are probably going to invite regulation and intervention by the Federal government to prohibit the practice.

Mr. Coyle: I disagree on that last point. Pell Grants have been around for a long time. Institutions are governing that very, very closely with the Federal government. There are all kinds of procedures for it. Every other student on the campus qualifies for that kind of money and we are denying our student-athletes the opportunity to participate in a bona fide program to help pay for these legitimate expenses.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): I rise to express opposition to this amendment. The Pell Grant is fully expected to share in the cost of education. I do concur with my colleague who said that if you finally go to the full Pell Grant being awarded to the athlete, I think this Association is

inviting the complete loss of a flexibility that it has today. I think that in the final analysis this would produce more harm to the athlete than what one thinks is going to come as a result of this amendment. I certainly urge all of my colleagues in Division I-AA not to support this action.

[Proposal No. 23 (Page A-17) was defeated.]

Financial Aid — Pell Grants

James I. Robertson Jr. (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 24 is similar to the proposal sponsored last year by the NCAA Council on behalf of the Special Committee on Financial Assistance of Student-Athletes. The special committee was appointed to study the value of an athletics grant-in-aid for student-athletes. The committee established guidelines in an attempt to seek ways in which financial aid would be able to meet the full cost of college attendance including room and board, tuition fees and books. The committee survey indicated that there is a difference between the cost of attendance and the value of a full grant in each of the institutions in the survey. The \$1,400 figure represents what is the average difference between the value of a grant-in-aid and the actual cost of attendance at an NCAA institution. It does not cover the full cost, but it does represent an increase from the \$900 Pell Grant maximum that is currently in effect. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

Asa N. Green (Livingston College): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 24 for the same reasons I spoke in opposition to Proposal No. 23. I have philosophical concerns about it. The only difference is really that this would limit the added cost to substantially \$500 per student-athlete. But that will be a heavy burden on Division II, and I would urge Division II and again our friends in Division III to oppose it.

I would like to respond to one question. The point has been made frequently over the years in this debate that by not exempting all or part of the Pell Grant from the financial aid limitations that we are somehow depriving our student-athletes of a benefit that is available to other students. It also seems to me that that overlooks the fact that our other students do not begin with the base of a really substantial grant-in-aid for their participation in intercollegiate athletics. They are already getting a benefit that is not generally available to all of the students that are at our institutions. There are students on other scholarships, but it is not uniform.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I beg to differ with my colleague. If we are talking about a philosophical approach to financial aid, it is impossible for me to accept the philosophical concept that a young person who is entitled to this money is denied this money and then the university takes that money and applies it to its general scholarship funds.

If there is anything wrong philosophically, that is what is wrong philosophically. For once and for all, we have a chance to help this young person who is denied now on our campuses in many cases the amount of financial aid that other students get because they are not athletes. For once and for all, we could do something that is right. We are not going with an unlimited amount of money; we are going with the average grant that is now out there, and philosophically we are for once standing up for the rights of the student-athlete. I urge that we support this amendment.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I want to speak and urge everyone to vote in favor of this amendment. I think that we have a difference of those who use this Pell Grant for scholarship moneys and those who do not. Those who do not are faced with the incidental expenses that keep coming up every year. Here is the way to help those that really need the funds and benefit those and disregard the incidental expenses that we have been talking about so many times.

Asa N. Green (Livingston College): Mr. Chair, I think this points out the need for us to carry forward on our deliberation on the proposal to take financial aid out of the Constitution. As I commented in the Council meeting the other day, I have talked to every Division II president I have encountered in the last year urging support for that proposal. I understand the concerns of Division I; I differ with them philosophically. I do not like to be in a position of opposing something that they want to do and can afford. On the other hand, I cannot, on behalf of my institution nor I think other Division II institutions accept their imposing their will on us and adding a cost burden to us that we can ill afford. So I would again urge the Division II delegates to vote against the proposal and solicit the support from Division III.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I am in sympathy with Division II, because there is a financial impact on scholarship budgets. But in the interest of fair deliberation, I am curious as to why Division III would vote against it when they do not have an athletics scholarship budget.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-18) was defeated.]

Financial Aid — Undergraduate Student Athlete

Eugene F. Corrigan (Notre Dame University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this is permissive legislation. It will allow but not require an institution to continue to provide financial aid to a student-athlete who is a full-time undergraduate student. It has been argued that the current rules protect the institution from extra costs but do not provide sufficient opportunity for the student-athlete to get his or her degree. This proposal does not require any additional costs to the institution but gives the institution greater flexibility in providing for the needs of its student-athletes. Last year's Convention amended Constitution 3-4-(g) so that the institution is not required to give the July 1 notice to a grant-in-aid student who has exhausted eligibility to compete. Accordingly, there is no obligation to provide the nonrenewal notice to a student-athlete who will not continue to receive aid.

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-18) was defeated (405-217), two-thirds majority required.]

Financial Aid — Summer School

Samuel L. Becker (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I would move the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would also like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 26-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is just simply for clarification, because the questions were raised precisely about what the amendment referred to, what part in the bylaw.

[Proposal No. 26-1 (Page A-19) was defeated.]

Mr. Becker: Let me say I am glad to see another noncontroversial amendment here today. Let me say that it seems to me this is noncontroversial, because it is consistent with all of our efforts we have been taking for some years to improve the chances of all student-athletes getting a good education. Despite the amended Bylaw 5-1-(j), which goes into effect this fall for Division I members, all of us know that there will be some students eligible to compete as freshmen in all of our divisions who are not as well prepared for college as they ought to be, students who need a little time to adjust to college-level work before jumping into the demanding role of student and athlete.

My institution agrees with what I take to be the majority view of this body, that banning all freshmen eligibility as some people advocate is not a good solution to that problem. However, we also believe that the concerns that have given rise to the proposal for a total ban cannot be totally ignored especially by those of us who wish to maintain freshmen eligibility. Amendment No. 26 speaks responsibly to these concerns. It will help disadvantaged students who we have reason to believe will have trouble adjusting to college and participating in demanding fall sports at the same time. We can help them get a good start in school in the summer session before they throw themselves into the dual role of students and athletes. Therefore, consistent with the other progressive actions that you have taken in the past few years, I sincerely hope that you will support this amendment.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-19) was defeated.]

Financial Aid — Established Awards

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): On behalf of the Eligibility Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee has found that it is not unusual for financial aid awards to exceed the present \$1,000 limit. The committee feels that recipients should be able to receive such awards without member institutions being required to reduce the award. The one-year restriction in the current provision also appears to be unnecessary, because there are sufficient safeguards in the present legislation to avoid an institution from obtaining an improper recruiting advantage and to prevent the awarding of improper financial assistance.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-19) was approved.]

Financial Aid — Honorary Awards

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of Proposal No. 28 is to recognize that we should permit our scholar graduates from high school, such as a high school valedictorian, to retain, let us say, an honorary academic scholarship of \$500 and at the same time to be able to receive a full ride in some sport upon entry into one of our colleges. I believe that we all recognize that our so-called full ride does not cover a student's full expense. I think we all feel that we should recognize the academic achievement that any student earns in his high school years, and I feel that it is grossly unjust for this Convention to consistently prevent a student from retaining the awards of his high school achievement academically and then the award he receives to participate in athletics in the future.

All this would do is to permit individual student-athletes to retain honorary

awards from a high school and retain his full ride. It is simply no more than an extension of our present position in which a student retained in college can retain an academic award. I think the legislation, as drafted, provides sufficient assurance to institutions. You would have the award through the member collegiate institution who would then check the high school's program to assure that this was a legitimate honorary award.

[Proposal No. 28 (Page A-20) was defeated (386-208): two-thirds majority required.]

Financial Aid — Equivalencies

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 29-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 29-1, the amendment to the amendment, is to clarify what I hope really will be a noncontroversial point. Right now the NCAA rules, our own rules for equivalency sports, indicate that if a young man or a young woman with a partial scholarship, any sport, needs some extra money and goes out all on his or her own with no help from the coach, finds outside there are two possible jobs that the young man or young woman could get, one working as a research assistant for his or her history professor, and one is bagging groceries down at the IGA, our rules require that the student right now take the job at the IGA rather than working for the history department because any form of work in the university would be considered O.I. 600(a) and that would count against your sport limit.

We are talking only about allowing a student on his or her own to get employment, not in a physical education department, not in the athletics department, some other job in the university. We don't think it should count against the equivalency. You should encourage the student to take the history job rather than the one at the grocery store.

[Proposal No. 29-1 (Page A-22) was defeated (283-328).]

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal. I believe it opens a bag of worms with the improprieties of on-campus jobs that we have closed. In the case of the equivalency sport where you will have the baseball coach trying to work it out with the chemistry department or something else in order to get these kinds of situations, I think it opens up an area of concern in financial aids that we do not need to open, and I would urge you to oppose it.

[Proposal No. 29 (Page A-21) was defeated.]

Drug Testing

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Drug-Testing Policy, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to authorize the Executive Committee to establish a drug-testing program for NCAA championships and certified postseason football contests, to establish a list of banned drugs, to authorize penalties for institutional staff members who know of use by student-athletes of banned drugs and who fail to follow institutional procedures regarding drug abuse, to

require student-athletes in conjunction with the annual signing of student-athletes at the same time to consent to be tested for drug usages, to establish loss of postseason eligibility as a consequence of the use of a banned drug by a student-athlete and to stipulate the revision of Executive Regulations necessary to finance the cost of this program.

I will comment regarding the proposal, and in behalf of the NCAA Council, and encourage the adoption of Proposal No. 30 as this proposal seeks to establish a fair, clean, direct, great competition at NCAA championships and certified postseason contests. It provides a mechanism for testing the championship's participants for the presence of any substance on the list of NCAA banned drugs and establishes the loss of postseason eligibility as a consequence of the use of a banned drug by a student-athlete. It deals with the postseason eligibility and allows the institution to conduct inseason testing only if it elects to do so.

Finally, if this proposal is passed, a Special Committee on Drug Testing will complete its assignment by recommending a testing protocol closely following that in the guidance of the I.O.C. and the U.S.O.C., which has been proven very successful.

William D. Bradford (Duke University): I wish to support this amendment and legislation. This is designed to protect the health and safety of the student-athlete and to promote fairness of competition. It will involve the all-important rubric of informed consent, chain of custody and state of the art technology.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): We move the adoption of Proposal No. 30-1. We understand the expected ruling from the Parliamentarian, but we do hope by this proposal to place before the Convention both the emphasis upon institutional responsibility in addressing this very serious problem and the idea that the proposals of the drug committee in the book that was issued last year will provide a sound base and sound evaluation, a sound vehicle for beginning institutional addressing of this problem by institutions which otherwise have not done so in a systematic way.

[Proposal No. 30-1 was ruled out of order.]

Paul W. Gikas (University of Michigan): I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 30. You will recall last year I was quite strongly opposed to Proposal No. 75, which was the drug-testing proposal of last year, because of some provisions concerning the policeman role of the physician and the lack of an exemption for certain prescription drugs and the fact that three drugs are not included. This year's proposal has been modified to remove all of those deficiencies. The role of the team physician and athletics staff members has been changed considerably. They merely have to follow institutional procedures dealing with drug abuse. They do not really serve a role as a policeman like they had to before. There have been exceptions made to allow those few legitimate examples where prescription drugs would be in violation.

This has eliminated that, and it has added street drugs, which is an important addition. There is no question but that testing has demonstrated that it deters, and to deter is to prevent.

Steven Danish (Virginia Commonwealth University): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal, because of what I am afraid it will do by its passage. First, Dr. Voy, in talking about this proposal yesterday, emphasized five steps. The big step was, and I would like to quote. He said, "Of course, rehabilitation is an essential part of this proposal." It would appear to me that the concern is for the sport and not the athlete. I am concerned that if this passes

our body will use this to avoid thinking about the concern of what we do for the athlete. I am concerned that we are not really trying to help the athlete and prevent and treat the athlete's potential problem with drugs.

Dr. Bradford: Mr. Chair, I would call the attention of the Convention to Proposal No. 107, which speaks to this important rubric of any drug education and testing program. It is entitled "Drug Rehabilitation Expenses."

John W. Ryan (Indiana University, Bloomington): Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of this proposal and to urge the support of it by the delegates of this Convention. The proposal is the product of the careful work of a select committee. The Presidents Commission watched the work of that special study as it was carried on. The results were reported to us. Proposal No. 30 was discussed at length by the Presidents Commission at their meeting here on Sunday, and the Presidents Commission unanimously voted to instruct me to report to you and to the delegates that we support Proposal No. 30 and hope that the delegates will vote for it.

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-22) was approved.]

Resolution: Gambling

Don J. DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is designed to send a strong message to President Reagan's Commission on Organized Crime in its effort to strengthen legislation before the Congress. This Federal legislation would prohibit gambling in intercollegiate athletics and prohibit interstate transportation of wagering information on all amateur sports. We urge a strong endorsement for this Federal commission in Proposal No. 31.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-26) was approved.]

[Proposal Nos. 32, 33, 34, 35 (Page A-26—A-28) were withdrawn.]

Legislative Proposals — Cost Estimates

William H. Baughn (University of Colorado): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the membership recalls, last year we passed legislation that required that there be included in the proposals the estimated cost of any activity that would impose substantial cost on this Association. No. 36 is a sequel to that and would do exactly the same thing to protect our member institutions so we would have an opportunity to know the cost benefit of items that we are asked to vote on before we pass the legislation. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 36 (Page A-28) was approved.]

[Note: The agenda was reordered to consider Proposal Nos. 37, 56 and 59 together.]

Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

Harvey Schiller (U.S. Air Force Academy): On behalf of the Executive Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 37-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would discontinue the indoor track championships. It is inconsistent with the thinking of the Association to have indoor track championships when separate championships are not offered in other sports. For

example, fall and spring sports, such as basketball, soccer and others do not have the same advantage. In addition, although the distances may vary somewhat between indoor and outdoor, essentially the same events are conducted in the indoor and outdoor championships. This means that track and field is the only sport that provides certain athletes with three national championship opportunities. Cross country, indoor and outdoor track have had a total subsidization that represents 32 percent of the Association's underwriting of NCAA championships, while only 21 percent of the student-athletes in NCAA championships were track and field athletes.

The total subsidization for indoor track in 1985 was \$353,000. The total for all three events was \$1.56 million. We all know that in most, if not all institutions, competitors in outdoor track and field compete also in indoor track and cross country. Indoor track may be looked upon as an extension of outdoor track where championship opportunities would still exist with this change. Again in summary, track and field competitors only comprise 21 percent of the student-athletes that competed in 1984-85 and yet received 32 percent of funds used to subsidize championships. The Council and the Executive Committee urge your support of this proposal.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): It is interesting that we are talking about a 10 percent disparity in numbers when yesterday at the Convention we dealt with a 33 percent disparity and yet the Ivy's overwhelmingly were adopted. Indoor and outdoor track had been an integral part of the NCAA competitions for campuses for a number of years. The indoor track championship does have a financial cost impact, but it is curious that we are proposing this for financial reasons during a year when the NCAA for the first time had a surplus in funds that was distributed to the membership. I see the reduction of indoor track and field for some schools, and Georgetown University is not among them so I have no self-interest in this particular item. There are some schools that would have to introduce new sports with an increase in cost to them as members of the NCAA, and therefore, the illusion that we are saving money in one pocket while we are spending it out of another pocket certainly makes us understand that we are not saving money. The limiting access to indoor championships and to counting of track and field, indoor and outdoor as one sport, would be extremely detrimental to our Olympics program as well as to the best benefits of the student-athletes at our institutions.

Robert S. Devaney (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I am in agreement with this last thought. We have defeated or passed some things because of money. We just had that done regarding the Pell Grant. Now, we are coming up and going to eliminate a sport. If we are going to eliminate indoor track in the NCAA championships, you might as well throw it out for the conference and everything else. If they do not have an NCAA championship to go to, you are diluting the indoor track program tremendously. Indoor track makes us a little money in a real nonrevenue producing sport. I see no reason whatsoever for the abolishing of indoor track.

Richard Roberts (Division I Track and Field Coaches Association): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. Hopefully, most of you have read the case study that our executive committee prepared and distributed to all Division I men's and women's track coaches. It was also printed in the recent issue of The NCAA News. Our Association unanimously feels that the indoor championships for men and women are an important and justifiable sponsorship at the NCAA championship level. An article in The NCAA News earlier

this year challenged that the world's oldest sport enjoyed too favored a position in the NCAA sphere of conducting championships. This assumes that cross country, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field are not different sports, which is not the case. Although it is possible for a very select few athletes to compete in all three championships, the numbers that compete in only one of the three are far greater. The indoor championship, for instance, is not even having a distance race longer than 3,000 meters, which is short of two miles. Many of our member institutions that do participate enthusiastically in track and field think of track and field as far more of an indoor season than the outdoor season. This northern tier of states in any given year, we only have three to five weeks of acceptable weather for an outdoor schedule to the outdoor championships. Indoor track and field is track and field to them. They are going to compete more in indoor track than outdoor track whether we have a championship or not, and eliminating these championships will take away a large part of the purpose of sponsoring track and field at these institutions.

Many of our members have built indoor track or field facilities as a result of the sponsorship of the national championship. To conduct a program without a championship to look forward to seems to be counterproductive to the full oriented behavior that we attempt to instill in our athletes.

We could go on and on with all kinds of rhetoric justifying the indoor championship among the sponsored events. Even many of us have chosen to make a case study that would support the championship as such an event. The bottom line is money, and we know it.

Leroy T. Walker (North Carolina Central University): I happen to be the president of The Athletics Congress and the U.S. representative to the International Amateur Athletics Federation, which controls track and field around the world. I would like to not only endorse the statements made by my colleagues previously, but to indicate to this body if you abort indoor track and field, you literally will be taking the United States out of the competitive edge and losing that edge in terms of worldwide track and field. The Europeans with their indoor championships and all of the Iron Curtain countries with their indoor championships is an extension in order to prepare for all of the regional games as well as the Olympic games. Just recently, the International Federation adopted a world indoor championship, the first of which will be contested in Indianapolis next year. It is an extension, and to reduce this particular opportunity for our athletes, 22,000 of which enjoy this particular participation, is going to develop and strike a very serious blow to track and field in this country. As a member of the executive board of the United States Olympic Committee, I can tell you your vote can very adversely affect our indoor track program in this country.

Richard M. Bay (Ohio State University): Mr. Chair, I really have a question connected with the three items that we are discussing. First, I am in favor of keeping the indoor track championships, but I am against counting indoor and outdoor track as two separate sports. My question is, can we have it both ways? Can we have indoor and outdoor track count as one sport but still have two separate championships?

President Davis: The Council discussed that and agreed that you could have it that way; that indoor and outdoor track could count as one sport at your institutions, and that we could have separate indoor and outdoor track championships.

[Proposal No. 37 (Page A-29) was defeated.]

Track and Field

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

It may seem a bit unusual for someone who had the opportunity of participating in the Olympic Games in the sport of track and field to be supporting this proposal. But in spite of any indebtedness to the sport, I find myself taking that position for several reasons. Track and field is the only sport that allows an institution to count a sport more than once to meet the requirement of sports sponsorship. If a Division I institution is a sports sponsorship minimum, eight for men and six for women, and it considers cross country, indoor and outdoor track in three of those sports, in essence, the institution is actually sponsoring only six different men's programs and four different women's programs. Current data indicate 61 Division I men's programs and 41 Division I women's programs sponsor the minimum number of sports and utilize the three-sport count of track and field to meet the minimum requirements. Our current practice of multiple counting in the sport of track and field is simply inconsistent with the philosophy of supporting any kind of broad-based intercollegiate athletics program. I urge you to support this proposal.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Can I ask a question? I just want to be sure that I understood Dave's last comment. Did he say that only 61 and only 41 schools are in that situation? Were those the two numbers?

Mr. Maggard: Frank, the information we have available, in the current data we have, 61 Division I men's programs and 41 Division I women's programs sponsor the minimum number of sports and utilize the three-sport count — indoor, cross country and outdoor track — to meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. Rienzo: I just want to be sure. It is my understanding there are approximately 289 institutions in Division I and there are only 61-41 that we are concerned about and going to affect the rest of them. Is that correct?

President Davis: I think it is the other way, Frank. The remainder would not be affected at least for the present if the amendment were to pass.

Mr. Rienzo: That is correct. But we are going to pass legislation that deals with only a very small number and I, therefore, would not support this.

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): Again using the same reason and rationale that Dave Maggard did for Division II, this would allow you to count that sport twice. With the two-team sport requirement currently, you can obviously understand the reductions in sports sponsorship that would be required as a result of this legislation. I, therefore, urge its passage.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): We are completely supportive of the rationale that Dave Maggard presented as far as indoor track is concerned. We have been and are firm believers of the broad-base programs. This strays from that basic principle. We urge you to support the amendment that has been presented to you.

Eugene M. Hughes (Northern Arizona University): I am president of Northern Arizona University. I rise to oppose Proposal No. 56. During the past seven years, I have devoted a lot of time and energy to intercollegiate athletics. In an attempt to maintain Division I-AA membership with eight sports, we have been able to count indoor track to do that.

We, as with many other institutions, are faced with financial difficulties that face the future of intercollegiate athletics and all the other programs of our uni-

versity. I have had to make a decision within the last two weeks to drop one of our sports for women. I am now faced with making a decision about one of the sports for men. I would prefer the prerogative as the president of the university to make that decision than to have this decision made on the basis of a recommendation from the NCAA. I think as I have analyzed the sports of track we find, in fact, there are track athletes who participate in both indoor and outdoor track. However, in many cases they are different events; and in some respects I believe you could look at it as a different sport. We, as other institutions, have invested a lot in physical plants and we have in our sky dome indoor track. If, in fact, we do not have indoor track to be counted as a separate sport, then we will be faced with the decision to do away with it also. I would encourage those of you who have supported indoor track for all these decades to continue supporting it as one of the sports that can be counted for membership for NCAA.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-42) was approved by Division II; defeated by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition

Vernon M. Smith (University of Toledo): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

This provides that indoor and outdoor track be treated as one sport in determining the number of seasons of competition of athletes.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I could not pass up one more chance. I think that this item deals more with the student-athlete than any of the previous two items. Here we are dealing with individual eligibility and, therefore, I would request that you vote no.

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-50) was approved by Division II; defeated by Division I and Division III (91-96).]

Criteria for Conduct of Championships

Judith M. Brame (California State University, Northridge): On behalf of the Council and the Divisions II and III Steering Committees, I move adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit the Divisions II and III Championship Committees to continue any existing Divisions II or III championships during the 1986-87 academic year. The championship committees were created to administer the block-grant funding for championships here in the respective divisions. The steering committees did not want a championship to be discontinued automatically during the first year of block-grant funding. It is anticipated that the championship committees and other interested parties will review the division championships to determine whether to suggest additional legislation for the future to give each division greater flexibility in identifying those sports in which it wishes to conduct championships within the block-grant funds allocated by the Executive Committee.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-30) was approved.]

Postseason Football Contests

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 39 is a housekeeping proposal. We are recommending that the 150 seconds be reduced to 120 seconds for the minimum amount of time for certified postseason football contests broadcasts and telecasts for promotional messages for participating institutions. Let me explain that most of the institutions are offering 30 seconds each for these messages. Therefore, that leaves a considerable amount of time to be filled for other purposes. We would think that this would be a reasonable request and, therefore, ask your approval.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-30) was approved.]

Recruiting Contacts

Michael T. Johnson (University of Houston): Mr. President, on behalf of the Southwest Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA currently prohibits in-person recruiting by representatives of the athletic interests of our member institutions off campus. The purpose of Proposal No. 40 is to eliminate in-person recruiting on the campuses of our institutions. We feel that will eliminate some of the problems that we are facing in recruiting and will put the responsibility for fair recruiting back on the coaches and get the boosters out of the loop, so to speak. So we urge the NCAA to pass this legislation.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I have a question of Mike. Does this inhibit in any way student posts from contact with recruits on the campus? The language would seem to do that.

Dutch Baughman (Southwest Athletic Conference): The intent of this legislation is not to prohibit the involvement of student-athletes on the institution's campus in the process of recruiting. It is only the student.

President Davis: It is the intent and would be part of the record of this Convention that institutional staff members would include for purposes of this legislation existing student-athletes on your campus.

Mr. Baughman: Right.

Mr. Gibbens: What about other students? In other words, I don't think we really want to restrict the on-campus contact to just student-athletes.

President Davis: You are right. With the indulgence of the Southwest Conference, I should have said all students that are on your campus still can be in contact with prospective student-athletes during their visit to the campus and that would not be precluded by this legislation.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): Would it not be possible under some set of circumstances for staff members of the institution to qualify as representing athletic interests through donations to the Athletic Department and in such case, restrict them from contact with recruits on campus?

President Davis: The same principle that applies to students interpreting the intent of this legislation would apply to any institutional staff members as well. Whether those staff members have outside interests would not be germane. Those staff members would be part of your institution and could be in contact with prospective student-athletes.

Allan Beigel (University of Arizona): I think the questions that have been raised about the interpretation of this proposal should suggest to the members that passage of this proposal will create a need for a whole new set of regulations to determine what are appropriate or inappropriate on-campus contacts, and who are appropriate and inappropriate people to make such on-campus contacts. Further, there is a whole range of casual contacts that come about on

campus that will now have to be interpreted as to whether they work for the purpose of recruitment as we go about taking out the phrase "off campus". I think this probably requires further study before we pass a rule in haste in an effort to indicate our desire to restrict noninstitutional staff members from participating in the campus recruitment.

Mr. Baughman: On behalf of the Southwest Athletic Conference, I move that this piece of legislation be referred to the Council for further consideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-31) was referred to the Council by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting — Evaluation Visits

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

I just would like to say that the intent of this is six visits per sport. Therefore, a basketball coach could view an athlete six times and a volleyball coach could view that same athlete six times.

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): Mr. President, the reason that we have brought this to the floor is to allow our coaches more time to spend on campus instead of having to go to every one of the 20 basketball games when they are recruiting someone. There are many athletes that if they look around and do not see a particular coach in the audience feel that that institution is no longer interested in them. We think that six times of being present at a contest is ample to evaluate the talent of that person and to show one's interest in him.

President Davis: Ann, you introduced a motion that made a comment that this pertained to each individual sport, but yet the amendment does not say that nor does the intent.

Ms. Lawler: That is the intent.

President Davis: I am sorry, but it doesn't say that in the motion that we would be voting on. It is not in the amendment itself nor in the intent.

Ms. Koenig: Mr. President, could the record not show as you had in the last motion that that is the intent, that it will be an official part of the business of the Association?

President Davis: The parliamentarian advises me that because of the prior circulation of this amendment that the amendment must reflect accurately the intent of the motion and that the delegates may have discussed this earlier in their meetings on the basis of what is in front of them and, therefore, any editorializing that drastically changes the motion would be out of order.

Ms. Koenig: Would it be in order to ask that this motion be withdrawn at this time?

President Davis: You may withdraw it if there is no objection. It is on the floor already. You have moved it, so it is a property of the body. I think we will have to go ahead and vote on it.

Ms. Lawler: Let's go ahead and vote on it.

President Davis: You could withdraw it.

Christine Grant (University of Iowa): If we cannot have a clarification, I move that we refer this to the NCAA Recruiting Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-31) was referred to the NCAA Recruiting Committee.]

Letter of Intent

Joseph L. Kearney (Western Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I would think to move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, I believe that it is very self-explanatory in your booklet and made very clear; and if there is additional information that is needed, I am sure we can provide it. At this time I would think it is very consistent and very clear in your booklet.

Kenneth G. Germann (Southern Conference): We would like a clarification regarding the statement "institutional financial aid." Is that athletically-related aid or any aid? If it is any aid, there are some institutions that might be awarding financial aid in agreement with a student-athlete who might be receiving other than athletically-related aid and they have problems whereby these things are done earlier in the year, much earlier than the letter of intent signing date. We would like to have clarification, please.

Mr. Kearney: Mr. President, I believe that it would refer to athletically-related financial aid.

President Davis: It does say an institutional or conference financial aid agreement that involves the signing date in any sport. That would refer to athletic-related financial aid.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-31) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Kenneth L. Germann (Southern Conference): There was some confusion in our Division I-AA meeting yesterday as to whether Proposal No. 43 pertained to sports other than football. If a football coach went in and a day later a track coach went in, would he be prohibited from it? We have since received a clarification from the NCAA staff that this applies to football only. That answers some questions that we had yesterday that led, I believe, to its defeat. Therefore I move to reconsider No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move reconsideration of the Proposal No. 43-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-32) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Resolution: Recruiting Contact Limits

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the proposal is to establish a limited recruiting contact period in all sports. However, rather than creating a brand new committee to deal with this proposal, we now believe that it is more appropriate and probably less expensive to refer it to the Recruiting Committee, which already is in existence. For that reason, I would move to refer this item to the NCAA Recruiting Committee, with the understanding that appropriate legislation will be presented to the 1987 Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

Chris Voelz (Collegiate Volleyball Coaches Association): Mr. President, although we were informed that an amendment that we did submit was out of order, we did want to speak to the spirit of that addition. We support this resolution but would suggest that in addition to the NCAA sports committees being

asked for advice by the Recruiting Committee, that also the coaches sports association would be involved.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-33) was referred to the NCAA Recruiting Committee.]

Tryout Rule

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 46 proposes the following substantive changes. First is the application of the tryout rule to individuals who have started the ninth grade or obtained the age of 15 in order to allow institutions to promote development of sports in the institution's community without the tryout rules constraints. Secondly, it includes in Bylaw 1-6-(c) a definition of open competition. This definition does not differ from existing interpretations, it simply has not appeared in the Manual before. Thirdly, it includes elsewhere in Bylaw 1-6-(c) language adopted by the Council in 1984 to distinguish between invitational and regularly scheduled competition involving primarily prospective student-athletes sponsored and conducted by member institutions.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-34) was approved by all divisions.]

Sports Camps, Coaching Schools and Clinics

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment constitutes the second half of the 1985 Proposal No. 137, which was not considered last year for lack of time. This amendment brings together legislation that currently affects what is in Bylaws 1-6-(e) and 1-10, and incorporates the camp and clinic's interpretation of Case No. 419. These related pieces of legislation and interpretations considering camps and clinics are grouped in a single location in the Manual immediately following the current tryout rules. It is important to note that this proposal does not change any existing legislation or interpretation.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-35) was approved by all divisions.]

Printed Recruiting Aids

Helen Smiley (Western Illinois University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to clarify which printed materials may be sent to prospective student-athletes. There are many questions regarding which type of athletics and nonathletics printed materials may be distributed to prospective student-athletes by the athletics department. Permissible terms have been determined by the Council's interpretation rather than membership legislation. This Council has considered the division of the various subsections and provides an opportunity for the membership to determine exactly which materials may be legally distributed. Our very special concern has been the question with regard to athletics departments' distribution of institutional academic materials, catalogues and applications. The interpretation has been that this must be done through the normal channels of the institution rather than through the athletics department.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): May I have an interpretation from the chair? It is my understanding that based on current interpretations, particularly Case No. 184, that the existing authorized printed materials include the items mentioned under (i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi). If this legislation were defeated, those would still be permissible printed recruiting aids, is that correct?

President Davis: That is correct.

Mr. Witte: In other words, the only additions would be in (iv), one annual schedule poster per sport, and in (vii), policy manuals, team rules or other department publications, whatever that might be. Is that correct?

President Davis: That is correct.

Mr. Witte: Under that interpretation, Mr. Chair, I would ask the delegates to oppose No. 48. It seems to me that (iv) is an unnecessary recruiting aid. It serves very little useful purpose in terms of information. It would be an unnecessary expense as schools begin to compete towards the fanciest posters. No. (vii), any such information can be contained with the recruiting brochure given to the student-athlete after enrollment and No. 48 is unnecessary and unwise.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I would like to object to the interpretation of the chair from the standpoint of how would the membership vote against doing that or to eliminate what already was an interpretation. It seems to me that if you voted against this, you would vote against permissiveness in terms of being able to do it.

President Davis: That was not the ruling of the chair. The question was asked whether or not Case 184 currently permits an institution sending to a prospective student-athlete those items listed in Nos. (i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi), and the answer was yes, that is currently permitted under Case 184. The next question was, then, is Item (iv) and Item (vii) the only new additions to the proposal? The answer was yes.

Ms. Lopiano: The question was also asked if No. 48 was defeated, would the interpretation still be in effect.

President Davis: It would still be in effect. The interpretation would still stand. It is a published case. Since this amendment does not address the published case, before that case could be changed, either the Council or the membership would have to change the case.

Ms. Lopiano: It seems to me the way to handle this is a motion to divide so you rule on each item.

President Davis: If that were your intention, Donna, then that would simply move the existing legislation from the case to the Bylaws, and if your intention is to divide by removing Items (iv) and (vii), then we would simply have the existing case moved into the Bylaws.

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): We were also concerned—in fact, this may be the main thrust of the proposal—about No. (i) because we have an interpretation that the athletics department could not send out academic materials or admissions materials to student-athletes.

President Davis: The current ruling is that the institution can send to the student-athlete materials with regard to admissions and the student services publication that is available to all students.

Ms. Grant: Yes, that is consistent with the interpretation that we were given. But one of the purposes of this particular piece of legislation was to permit the athletics department to send the athletic materials and the admissions materials, because we find ourselves getting bogged down with regard to get-

ting these particular pieces out to our prospective student-athletes. So, No. (i), (iv) and (vii) are of concern to us.

President Davis: You are correct, that this would make Items (i) as well as (iv) and (vii) different than the case.

Ms. Grant: Would it be possible, then, to divide this question?

President Davis: Yes, it would.

Ms. Grant: I move the adoptions of groupings (i); then (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi), then (iv) and then (vii).

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-37) was approved in part by all divisions after successful motion to divide. Subparagraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi) were approved by all Divisions; subparagraphs (iv) and (vii) defeated by all divisions (89-91) in Division III.]

Transportation to Campus

Delbert Wells (New Mexico State University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, this Amendment No. 49-1 would allow an institution staff member to provide transportation from the nearest airport to campus when the student initially arrives at the institution to attend classes. Many of our institutions are located in or near cities and towns that have smaller airports not served by national carriers. This amendment-to-the-amendment would allow institutions to provide this initial transportation to campus from the nearest major airport where national carrier service is available.

[Proposal No. 49-1 (Page A-38) was approved.]

Delbert Wells (New Mexico State University): I would like to speak to the intent of Proposal No. 49. I think that the information is clear and the intent is spelled out in your information. Some of the people in the outlying areas have to bring athletes in for the initial visit; and I want to make that clear, it is only the initial visit of the athlete to the campus that we are concerned with. Very often at this visit, the athlete has a difficult time making travel arrangements from this airport to the campus. He does not have any on-campus connections yet. He is a stranger, and it is only for the convenience for this athlete. I think you realize that if you look at some of the areas that are supporting this proposal. In Las Cruces, for example, our nearest airport is El Paso. We have a strong suspicion there are a number of students wandering the El Paso area that have never found our campus.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-37) was approved as amended by No. 49-1.]

Self-Financed Visits — Transportation

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is fairly self-explanatory. What it intends to do is to permit an institution to show the prospective student-athlete who is visiting the campus at his own expense, his or her own expense, the competitive facilities of the institution, which in some cases may be the golf course or the golf team, the cross country

course or ultimately even the downtown arena where basketball games are played. It is limited again to the 30-mile radius and also restricted to just direct transportation to view and tour those facilities and does not permit an extended tour of the city on a sightseeing excursion.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-38) was approved. A later motion to reconsider in Division I was defeated.]

[The Convention recessed at noon.]

GENERAL BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Afternoon, January 14, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. with President John Davis presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting — Tryouts

Barbara B. Hollmann (University of Montana): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would prohibit our basketball coaches from involvement with summer AAU basketball teams. The Recruiting Committee believes that supporting this action will resolve the concern expressed by our coaches that an unfair recruiting advantage is gained by those coaches involved with AAU teams.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-38) was approved.]

Recruiting — Complimentary Admissions

Frederick Hemke (Northwestern University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal relates to the entertainment an institution is permitted to provide for a prospect who visits the institution at his or her own expense. Current legislation permits the three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event. The proposed amendment limits those complimentary events to solely an institution in which the intercollegiate team competes. The Council believes the proposal is consistent with the original intent of the legislation and to prohibit institutions from providing complimentary admission to other athletics contests conducted on their campuses. As you know, an institution's facilities are often used for other games, including all-star games, professional contests, and play-off games. It is thought that complimentary admissions could result in a recruiting advantage to institutions whose facilities are used for such contests. The Council asks that you support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-39) was approved.]

Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will provide the Council with the authority to grant waivers of the four years' sponsorship requirement for membership in the Association for those institutions that demonstrate the male/female ratio prohibits the offering

of the required number of sports for one or the other. If approved, the legislation would allow the Council after review of all information provided from an institution with an enrollment in either the male or female population to grant a waiver of sponsoring four sports for both men and women. The waiver would be prohibited only in cases where the enrollment would not support the requirement for four sports, thus, not changing the present situation that an institution sponsor four sports for men and women in order to be a member of the NCAA.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-41) was approved.]

Division I-A Criteria

Richard Thigpen (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): I spoke against this yesterday in our Division I-A meeting. I think it is particularly appropriate to bear in mind what we did with the track proposals. We made track, indoor and outdoor track, two sports. If you reduce the requirement to six, realistically, obviously, everyone wants to keep it to the absolute bottom level and use track as two sports, you are really talking about reducing the requirement to five. While we realize that there is some budgetary problems with this, we talked about yesterday at the NCAA Honors Luncheon about what a great experience of participation athletics is, how wonderful it was to give these kids the opportunity. If we mean that, we should have broad-based programs and we ought not be doing things that inevitably will be to the demise of some sports, particularly in women's programs. I think we took a very wise step yesterday in not reducing the number of sports for minimum I-A requirements. So I would hope that you would stay with not reconsidering the motion and not reduce the number of sports that will be required to be in Division I-A. That will restrict that broad-based coverage that we would like to provide to a lot of students throughout our schools.

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): Mr. Chair, as one of the sponsors of this legislation, I would like to ask that you consider this 12-sports requirement. It is already in Division I. We do not oppose those who can afford to have broad-based programs. Financially, it is a strain on many of us. I think the close vote indicates it is a tough budgetary problem, and we would ask that you would consider passing this legislation for 12-sports.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 59 in Division I-A failed (54-55).]

Division I-A Criteria

Michael T. Johnson (University of Houston): In behalf of the Southwest Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

This requires little comment. What it would do in effect is reduce the number of required men's and women's sports for Division I-A to seven from eight. I urge the passage of this proposal.

Richard M. Bay (Ohio State University): Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this proposal and for the same reasons that were stated relative to the previous proposal. Really, I believe you can take track and field and have three sports as a result of cross country being included, which would leave you with

the responsibility of fielding only four other sports. Two of those would be football and basketball; obviously you would be left with only two. I am not insensitive to the financial pressures that we all face relative to fielding the athletic teams that we have on our campuses. Indeed, I was at an institution before I came to Ohio State where we struggled to field the minimum number of sports required by Division I in the NCAA. Even now I am at an institution where we are struggling to maintain our present program. At the same time, I think being a member of Division I implies a certain responsibility to have a comprehensive program. They can supply certain responsibility to have a comprehensive program; and I fear if we get too far apart in this regard, those philosophies could possibly threaten the further decisiveness of this organization in terms of the way we are structured. I would hope that everyone would vote against this proposal, keep the minimum of eight and do our best to field as many teams as possible.

Robert L. Hitch (Southern Methodist University): I know you get tired of private schools talking, but it costs us approximately \$12,000 to send a student-athlete to school at SMU. We are talking about next year having to add two sports, one team sport that was settled earlier, and now another sport. I get tired of people talking about how insensitive they are, how insensitive they want to be to other people. It does not seem to me at this particular point that we are. We have a problem financially. We have gone to the bottom of the barrel, and that is as far as we can go. I urge you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-44) was approved by Division I-A (63-51).]

Change of Division Membership

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

Before proceeding, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 64-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment to the amendment simply changes the effective date making the effective date September 15th. This allows the schools that are already in the entrance situation period to play by the rules of the game that they have been playing all along.

William R. Johnson (Stephen F. Austin State University): Mr. President, I speak in support of the amendment to the amendment. Two of our institutions are affected by Proposal No. 64. Both are in the final months of compliance with Division I criteria having Division II members. We entered into a new conference and began the process of changing the division under rules that would provide for a two-year compliance period. If the amendment to the amendment is not adopted, and Proposal 64 is approved, the obvious effect will increase our period by three years. We believe the amendment to the amendment to be a more appropriate and equitable course and we urge its adoption.

Paige E. Mulholland (Wright State University): The movement into Division I, in accordance with present rules, is a two-year process, not a one-year process. The amendment being proposed does, in fact, blanket in or grandfather in those institutions that are in the second of those two years. It does not, however, provide for the blanketing in of those institutions that have made a public commitment, and in many cases a financial investment and are in the first year of that transition. Therefore, it falls short of being an equitable correction to No. 64 as it was originally printed.

David H. Adams (Akron University): I have a question. If we have declared one sport to be in Division II and are moving into that next year and we are Division I otherwise, would that fall under that same limitation?

President Davis: The limitation would apply if the change in that sport in Division II was affected after the effective date of the proposal.

Mr. Adams: I think we are required to go Division I next year regardless, so would that affect it at that time since we are required to go regardless?

President Davis: The interpretation is that this amendment affects only those instances where the entire institution changes its division membership. This does not affect the multidivisional membership of one institution that declares one sport in another division.

[Proposal No. 64-1 (Page A-47) was approved.]

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Mr. President, the adoption of both 64 will reduce the number of institutions that classify a sport or sports in a division other than their membership division by delaying their eligibility for championships for three years. It also would be consistent with the belief that institutions should treat all student-athletes comparably with a consistent institutional philosophy of athletics.

Paige E. Mulholland (Wright State University): I would like to continue the comments made with respect to the amendment, which I am glad to see passed at least for those institutions that it will affect. The problem with that proposition is in its entire concept. I have tried in vain to determine not what is meant by it but what its purpose is. I have heard you explain to my colleague from Akron that it does not have effect for the institution changing the category of only one sport. The only argument I have heard in its favor that is convincing, is that, in fact, to prevent institutions moving downward in the category of one sport and thus taking unfair advantage in their new category. The fact of the matter is that the categories of membership in the NCAA also can be defined by substantive criteria, namely, the amount of investment and the amount of commitment you have to a broad-based athletics program.

The changes we have approved here today in proposals such as Nos. 57 and 58 have been consistent with those substantive category definitions. A waiting limit is not a substantive criteria. It is unrelated to either commitment or to investment and smacks instead of a closed-club concept, which is not the traditions of the NCAA. In fact, the effect on those institutions that might aspire to more comprehensive programs is a negative one. This particular amendment restricts the insensitivity for making the kind of additional commitments and investments that are represented by such a move. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that excluding teams that might be otherwise qualified competitors for national championships on the basis of a waiting period alone cheapens the championships for those capable of winning them on the field or on the court. Beyond the concept problems, the way it is now drafted, this amendment is inequitable to those institutions in the first year of a movement process already publicly announced, committed and invested. It might even, in fact, suggest, although I have not checked the rules with complete thoroughness, that a non-NCAA member could join under more favorable circumstances than a long-time member could move. I respectfully urge all divisions to defeat this amendment as contrary to the spirit of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-47) as amended by No. 64-1 was defeated. It was approved by Divisions I and III, defeated by Division II; approval of all divisions required.]

Championships Eligibility

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is designed to address the issue for a member institution that holds its membership in one division and because of the lack of championship opportunities in that division is forced to participate in one of the other two divisions. The situation that it would address is one in which a Division II field hockey program, for example, because of the lack of a Division II championship, participates in Division I or III. If a team participates in Division I, it is still bound by the competitive dates and number of contests of Division II in the sport of field hockey. Those are four for Division II and four for Division I. If that institution participates in Division III, that disparity could be even greater since there are no limits in Division III. What this motion is to address is simply a competitive equity issue by allowing all institutions participating in the same competitive division to play the same number of contests or dates of competition.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-48) was approved by all divisions.]

Multidivision Classification

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Council and Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to provide greater flexibility to those Division II members that sponsor sports in which Division II does not conduct a championship but Division III does. Presently an institution can be eligible for a Division III championship in such circumstances under Bylaw 10-6-(c)-(2). However, such institutions are bound by Division II rules and more restrictive Division III rules. The institution cannot take advantage of Division III eligibility rules. This proposal would permit such Division III members to reclassify a certain sport into Division III only where there is no Division II championship and apply exactly the same rules as other institutions seeking to compete for the same Division III championship. Therefore, I urge the Convention's support of No. 66.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-48) was approved by all divisions.]

Multidivision Classification

Paul F. Dietzel (Samford University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rule now states that if you were not Division II football prior to 1 September, 1983, you are not eligible for championship consideration. Now, the rationale was obvious. If you move from Divisions I or II, which has scholarships, to III, which does not have scholarships, the residue of scholarship athletes would give you an unfair advantage. This legislation removes that possible advantage and causes a proper time period for all scholarship athletes to have graduated, those who do not transfer. Of course, when you move to Division III, many do transfer. More importantly, if this legislation is adopted, if you began a new Division III football program, your athletes would know that

they are part of the NCAA Division III football and eligible for the play-off system. Although as a practical matter, your new division freshman team will not challenge anyone in an established Division III team for several years. There is nothing hidden and no advantage gained or sought. We just believe that the NCAA would like to encourage smaller schools to begin the sport of football, not totally discourage it. Therefore, we urge the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

Robert D. Karnes (Drake University): I speak in support of this proposal. Our institution is one of several classified as Division I that has taken or is considering action to sustain football in Division III. Such actions have been taken to keep football alive on our campus as part of our athletics program but reduced to a level consistent with our resources and objectives. By complying with all conditions of Division III football, there is no justifiable reason to penalize or deny the student-athlete the opportunity to compete in the national play-offs. The time limit required to meet the Division III criteria insures that no grant-in-aid student-athlete remains on the team and that there will be fair competition for all. I urge the support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-49) was defeated. Approved by Divisions I and II, defeated by Division III (73-104); approval by all divisions required.]

Seasons of Competition

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): On behalf of the Big Sky Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to explain what Proposal 68 is all about. First and foremost, No. 68 is for the good of student-athletes. No. 68 is about academic integrity. It is about increasing graduation rates for student-athletes. No. 68 is about simplification of the rules and consistency of the eligibility rules. Now, there are other byproducts of 68 that are not what 68 is primarily about; but they do provide benefits to all of us. First, No. 68 will help our coaches by relieving them of some difficult decisions regarding red shirting student-athletes and when to red shirt. Secondly, No. 68 will save our institutions money. We just passed No. 60 in I-A to help save institutions money. Three, No. 68 could help save sports and save opportunities from elimination. Let me explain. Proposal No. 68, first and foremost, is a proposal for the good of the student-athlete. It will benefit student-athletes tremendously by providing them with a better opportunity than they presently have. Providing five years of eligibility will increase graduation rates among student-athletes dramatically. The NCAA in 1975 took a survey of graduation rates of all male students across the country. That survey found that after five years, not four, but after five years only 41 percent of all nonathletes graduated. Fifty-two percent of the student-athletes graduated in five years.

I point this out to make clear that nationally only 42 percent of all students graduating did so in five years. I acknowledge also that there is a group of selected institutions across the country that do not graduate most of their students in four years. Proposal No. 68 would not be a detriment to these selected schools, as students could continue their education in graduate school and compete a fifth year if they so choose. Many of these selected schools currently must compete against other schools that use fifth-year students, and this rule could help them. Many student-athletes leave schools when their eligibility expires. We can wish this were not so and say the student-athletes would be more committed to academics. But the facts are that many students, nonath-

letes included, leave school before graduation for a variety of reasons.

We have focused on the entrance requirements to improve academic integrity. There is another major problem area that must be addressed if graduation rates are to improve and academic integrity is to be realized. That problem is one where the student eligibility expires. The NCAA satisfactory progress rule and eligibility rule requires a student to complete 12 hours per term. If you take 12 hours per term, it will take you five years to graduate. Most student-athletes are on a five-year academic plan, yet we only allow them to compete for four years. This means that students in football and all sports finish with their eligibility $3\frac{1}{2}$ years into a five-year plan. Many do not stay around the extra year and one-half because of the drastic change in lifestyle and for other reasons. By allowing five years of eligibility, all students would be $4\frac{1}{2}$ or five years into their academic plan when their eligibility expires. All could graduate, because by definition of our rules, they would be making progress towards their degree.

Proposal No. 68 would simplify our rules. By five years of eligibility, we could eliminate red shirting altogether. We could also eliminate the hardship rule, which I believe is misunderstood by many and can be abused. By eliminating red-shirted hardships, we can help the student-athletes, we can help the coaches, the division and ourselves.

Proposal No. 68 fortunately will help save money. By keeping grants the same, fewer students will have to be recruited each year. Some will say this will reduce opportunities. This is not the case. While we are reducing a few scholarship opportunities in a given year, there will be the same number of opportunities to participate. What should be noted is that if we can save money in the football recruiting and basketball recruiting, and let us say that amounted to \$20,000, we could take that \$20,000 and apply it to another sport, perhaps tennis or golf, or whatever, to save that sport from being dropped.

We have eliminated opportunities even today by reducing the sports-sponsorship criteria. Many schools cannot afford to pay for the fifth year, and No. 68 would provide the fifth year without increasing the cost to the institution. Now, there are no perfect rules in the NCAA, and I am not here to say this is a perfect rule. But the rule we are currently operating under is not a perfect rule either. What I would ask is that we compare our current rule, which results in low graduation rates, hardship cases and red shirting, to Proposal No. 68 and ask the question is 68 better than what we have. Many people have commented that we need more time to think about this proposition before we act on it. I would like to point out that there is going to be a year-and-a-half lead time before this proposal can be implemented. Because of the dates of the Convention and the fact that there are early signing dates in basketball in November, and for junior college football players, it will always be a year and a half down the road on whatever date this proposal is implemented. If, in fact, there are some questions that need to be answered or reviewed, we do, in fact, have 12 months to do that; and this proposal could be adjusted, if need be, next January, 1987. Proposal No. 68 gives us an opportunity to truly help our student-athletes to do something for their good and their welfare. It will insure academic integrity and serve to augment the entrance requirements we already have passed. It will help students graduate, will simplify the rules, and it will make the rules we have more consistent. It will save money, and it could increase opportunities.

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 68-1 (Page A-50) was approved.]

Jack V. Doland (McNeese University): I move to refer this matter to the Council and the Presidents Commission to be brought up at the 1987 Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-49) was referred to the Council and Presidents Commission.]

Transfer Rule — One-Time Exception

Eugene F. Corrigan (University of Notre Dame): I move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am moving this on behalf of the Council. During the past two years since the adoption of Bylaw 5-1-(f)-(14), members of the Council and others have observed its abuse in a number of ways. Although it was held as an opportunity for students to move to a different institution and under specific conditions to compete immediately, it has been an administrative nightmare to most of the Council and to the NCAA staff. The Council often has been called upon to make official interpretations of the regulation. It is difficult to determine whether the student involved has provoked a nonrenewal of aid in a deliberate attempt to take advantage of this provision or whether the student was in good academic standing and met satisfactory progress requirements upon leaving the previous institution, whether the student had been recruited away by another institution particularly when athletes leave Division III programs for those in I or II, and when is the appropriate time to have obtained a written certification of no objection from the previous institution.

Although institutions in Division I and Division III have complained most loudly about the rules, the Council felt it was appropriate to give all three divisions an opportunity to vote on the matter. There are other transfer exceptions in place to provide for students who should be exempt from the transfer rule. For example, Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(10) provides for the student who is not recruited, did not receive athletically-related financial aid and did not compete or practice in the previous institution. Division III has provided exceptions for most transfer students through Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(12) and (13). If there are other types of students who should be exempted from the transfer rules, specific exemptions could be developed. Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) is too broad, too vulnerable to abuse. We are not seeking to unduly restrict student-athletes from transferring; we are saying that legislation to permit transfer exception should be specific, an option to provide for a consistent application. We ask for your support of Proposal No. 70.

Clyde H. Witman (East Stroudsburg University): I like Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) as it is because it involves certain segments of the population that elects to transfer. Most people transfer for legitimate reasons. Provisions of this particular regulation include that the individual must be a satisfactory student academically, that he is not receiving financial assistance and it gives any institution the prerogative to negate anybody's right to the transfer exception since we do not give them a written release. It does not include our sports of football and basketball, but it does include all the other athletes that transfer for some very good reasons. If there are problems with this, let us clean it up. Let us not throw the baby out with the washboard. Let us let the kids play.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College [Iowa]): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of this proposal. The Division III member presidents meeting on Sunday discussed it at some length. There are no overall statistics on the use of this option, but there is abundant antidotal evidence of rising of lowering division programs to provide proven winners in a number of sports and moving them up. Those presidents have asked me to speak for this proposal and to urge our colleagues in the upper divisions to give consideration to our programs and restrict the unfair practices used by some of our peers.

Barbara B. Hollmann (University of Montana): I hope that you would oppose this. The abuse of this transfer exception can be controlled by our athletics directors who properly interpret and implement the intent of this exception criteria. Since the institution must certify in writing that it has no objection, let us not eliminate an extremely positive opportunity for our student-athletes because there have been abuses due to misinterpretations. We control it; let us just do that.

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): I have a question, Mr. President. The effective date is immediately. Does that mean if this passes that a student-athlete who has already initiated the transfer process during the current semester break would not be allowed to transfer?

President Davis: Mr. Sweazy, if the student had been initially accepted at the second institution prior to the effective date of the legislation, the student would not be affected by the legislation; but the student would have had to have been officially accepted, not necessarily there, but accepted by the second institution.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-51) was defeated by all divisions.]

Transfer Rule — One-Time Exception

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 71-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

We admit that current legislation is not perfect, particularly regarding the issue of nonrenewal of athletic aid in that it has not been clearly understood by all of us and perhaps misapplied in some cases. Proposal 71-1 retains the waiver provision as originally intended and attempts to rectify the problem areas as follows: (1) It uses language that clarifies what we understood the sponsors of the original waiver provision always intended. (2) It helps the certifying institution to properly comply with the rule by requiring that a written statement be obtained from the previous institution to verify that the athletically-related aid was not renewed for reasons unrelated to the students transferred or for reasons outside the student's control. Consequently, we urge support of 71-1.

[Proposal No. 71-1 (Page A-51) was approved.]

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): In an unprecedented display of taking account of reality, the Pacific-10 Conference submitted No. 71 under the assumption that half a loaf was better than no loaf. It now supports 71, as amended, on the theory that a quarter of a loaf is better than no loaf.

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-51) was approved as amended by No. 71-1.]

Transfer Rule — One-Time Exception

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

This specifies that Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) does not apply to women's basketball. It simply puts women's basketball in the same arena as men's basketball. Women's basketball has become a very competitive sport, and this will prevent some of the abuses we have just talked about in 70 and 71 from happening in women's basketball. This is strongly supported by the Women's Basketball Association.

James Ciszek (University of Lowell): When we discussed Proposal No. 48, it seems to be a mechanism within the NCAA to change the effective dates from September 1, 1986, to an earlier date. I would urge that the membership consider doing the reverse with Proposal No. 72. That is, change the effective date from immediately to September 1, 1986, for the benefit of students who have already communicated with schools concerning transferring under the rule as it presently exists.

President Davis: There is no way that the amendment can be introduced at this time to change the effective date of it. It was an interpretation of the Council that was earlier changed and not No. 48.

Mr. Ciszek: There is a difference between what we are looking at in 48 and what we are looking at in 72, is that my understanding?

President Davis: Yes.

Mr. Ciszek: Personally, I feel it is not doing justice to the female basketball players.

President Davis: The same interpretation that was given earlier with regard to student-athletes, if a student-athlete has already been accepted at the institution, then that student-athlete is not subject to the provisions of this immediate action of the convention. So if the student-athlete has already been accepted, then that provision is not applicable.

[Proposal No. 72 (Page A-51) was approved.]

Transfer Rule — One-Time Exception

Otto Breitenbach (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reasons for this, concerning the sport of ice hockey, are very comparable to what was just presented to you in regard to Proposal No. 72. Our problems, as far as the transfer rule under the bylaw, are similar to what football and basketball would not have if they were covered by the same rules. We urge the Convention to support it.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-52) was approved by all divisions.]

Transfer Rule — Residence Requirement

Dick Oliver (Southland Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to restrict Divisions I and II members from accepting four-year transfers at any convenient point of a semester's quarter and permitting these transferred student-athletes to use the short-end term to

count towards the fulfillment of the residency requirement. We as a conference adopted this policy two years ago after a case of this nature developed. It has worked.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-52) was approved.]

Junior College Transfer Student

Wayne Pierce (California State University, Stanislaus): On behalf of the Northern California Athletic Association, I move adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently transfers from four-year institutions are eligible at our member institutions if they meet the first three conditions of this amendment. I refer you to Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(10) on Page 101 that has been referred to earlier. The intent of this amendment is to extend the same transfer rights to junior college students. We have added Subsection (4) to insure the student is not using the junior college to become eligible for admission to the four-year institution. I urge your support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-53) was approved by Divisions II and III; defeated by Division I.]

Eligibility for Practice

Joan Board (Grand Valley State College): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal should have been included in the constitutional consent package. It should be noncontroversial. This corrects an oversight of some years ago. This proposal would make the eligibility rules consistent with the eligibility rules for competition.

[Proposal No. 76 (Page A-53) was approved.]

Five-Year Rule

James R. Spalding (Bellarmine College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal provides an opportunity for exceptions to the Divisions II and III five-year rule under guidelines similar to those currently used for Division I. The Council has already approved the application of the criteria set forth in Case No. 273 if this legislation is adopted. The criteria are intended to give the Eligibility Committee and the Council the authority to grant limited extensions of the five-year, 10-semester or 15-quarter period of eligibility. The Eligibility Committee or Council could grant an extension only when circumstances clearly supported by objective evidence establishes that a student-athlete is unable to attend a collegiate institution for reasons that are unrelated to the athletics or to personal or family finances and they are beyond the control of the student-athlete or the institution. For example, this would provide an opportunity for an extension for a student who at the beginning of a term as the full-time student was so seriously injured that he or she was required to withdraw for the remainder of the term for reasons that could be medically documented.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-53) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

Convention Committees — Nominees

Jeanne Rowlands (Northeastern University): On behalf of the sponsors, I

move adoption of Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

Given the kinds of society in which we live, given our history of choice in leadership, this amendment asks that that kind of choice be available in the selection of the Association leadership. Large, single candidate slates discourage the exercise of democratic choice. The concept of an election in a democratic society is a choice among two or more alternatives. This proposal would mandate a minimum two-candidate choice. Our current method of election does permit nominations from the floor. We are all, however, aware that the need to meet all the criteria — geography, division, gender, football playing conference, et cetera — places serious constraints on the reality of that possibility. The amendment's requirement that all nominating committees present at least two candidates for every elected office eases that task of finding two candidates who meets all of those requirements.

The mechanics of such an election are far from impossible. The election could be accomplished, of course, by a paddle on the floor as all other amendments are now handled. I would hope that the Association would much prefer a secret ballot that could be handled by the NCAA staff in the same very efficient manner in which they register the multitude of delegates each year. Indeed, our computerized roll call voting leads me to believe that we already possess the capabilities for a quick, efficient and absolutely accurate election here at the Convention.

I will not accept even the possibility that in a 1,000-member Association two highly qualified candidates willing to serve that Association could not be found for each office. Indeed, a nominating committee spokesperson at last year's Convention assured us there were enough nominees for every office to produce two-candidates slates. I urge you to vote yes on Proposal 81 and move us significantly forward toward the democratic exercise in the selection of Association leadership.

Albert E. Bender Sr. (St. Louis University): Proposal No. 81 is under one governance genus. It seems to me there are three species here. The first part, is a fairly complicated nominating process that now must be gone through, except added to that will be two names. The voting process would be quite complicated. The second matter, No. 5, has a very simple nominating process of two people and a very simple voting process and seems to be a very standard democratic practice in organizations such as this. It is frankly the traditional democratic American way, or however you want to phrase that. The sixth part has a somewhat complicated nominating process, but I do not think it is overwhelming. It is, in fact, much more complicated than No. 5 would be. For that reason, I move to divide Sections 4, 5 and 6 for voting purposes.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion failed.]

Arliss L. Roaden (Tennessee Higher Education Commission): I rise to speak against Proposal No. 81. There are, in fact, many qualified professionals in the Association who can and do serve the Association very well in leadership posts. Every year the full membership of the Association is invited to nominate persons for vacancies and to fill posts that are created by turnover from completion of terms. There are not, however, large numbers of the most qualified people who are standing in line ready to volunteer for service. They need to be convinced that their services are needed. The best qualified people have crowded agendas and have many competing demands on their time. I

doubt that many of them would consent to serve if faced with the process of competing for the post through an election process competing with other professionals. I think we would stand a chance of losing some very highly qualified people.

Another concern is the likelihood of politicizing the idea of selecting leaders with nomination speeches and the like. Most of the higher educational organizations with which I am familiar that once employed processes such as are advanced in Proposal No. 81 have since abandoned the process. I hope the Association will retain its most professional process and that we will reject this proposal.

John W. Ryan (Indiana University): I rise to speak to this motion and to urge the delegates to vote against it. I speak out of a different perspective as I look at the NCAA and what this Convention attempts to do on behalf of all its members. I think that this Convention is very political and that is appropriate. It is political in the sense that it directs our attention at every single policy, every single issue, every single detail of problems that the members, any five members, wish to bring to the attention of this Convention. I think the Convention is very democratic and it is appropriate that it be so. I do not know where you would find in the country a range of participation as we have witnessed yesterday and today where any institution, regardless of its size or location in the country or cut at the swath of higher education can call for any vote, participate in any vote, can bring to bear on the issues and the problems that this very political institution makes possible to bring forward.

What I have not seen yesterday and I have not seen today, and I have not seen in the past five Conventions that I have attended, and I hope never to see, is that this body is a political body in personality terms. I think that could be the only result of this particular proposal. I am opposed to it, and I hope you join me in opposition.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I support what Arliss Roaden and President Ryan have said. One of the criticisms I have heard is that once you get on the sports committees you stay on the sports committees. I would like to remind this Convention that the turnover on the sports committees, and I may not have the exact figures but I think I am fairly right, is around 57 percent for women and about 60 some odd percent for men. On general committees, the turnover is well over 50 percent. So we do have turnover on committees in the NCAA. I think this process has served us well over the years, and I urge you to vote against it.

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): I also would like to speak against Proposal No. 81. I am the current chair of the Men's Committee on Committees and have been on the Men's Committee on Committees for the past three years. No. 81 suggests that the membership has a limited opportunity to nominate candidates for sports committee vacancies. That just is not true. Nominations, as you know, are solicited in The NCAA News. You can even nominate yourself if you want. As a matter of fact, this year the Men's Committee on Committees considered 139 nominees for the sports-committee vacancies. So the nomination process is working and is generating some qualified candidates. The notion that you serve forever is also not valid. Persons up for reelection are evaluated by committee chairs prior to their reelection. Indeed, some incumbents have not been reelected.

In the three years of my experience on the Men's Committee on Committees, the turnover rate has been 80 percent. As a matter of fact, when you con-

sider all NCAA committees, those that are appointed by the Council, and there are 27 of those; the Nominating Committee, which selects the officers, the president, the vice-president, the members of the Council and the Executive Committee, and when you add in the men's and women's sports committees, of which there are 34, all combined in the last four-year period have turned over at the rate of 81 percent. Eight out of 10 people are being replaced every four years on all those committees that I have just named. So the process is working. Many people are getting the opportunity to serve. Proposal No. 81, if passed, also does not address that if we give you two candidates, how we elect them. Are we going to take another day for a political Convention to elect candidates? We have enough problems with the legislation in terms of getting it done in the required amount of time. We would probably have problems getting real qualified people to submit to an election process. Equally distressing would be the fact that somebody who had an unnatural or overzealous interest in a particular committee might be going into the SID office to say, "Stop the presses. We have to go to work on my campaign;" and come into this Convention with balloons, buttons and marching bands, pom-pom girls and whatever.

David E. Bennett (Syracuse University): We have heard from the previous speaker that Proposal No. 81 would be a dreadful error for this Convention to adopt here; but I rise, nonetheless, to speak for it. Of course, the NCAA has profited by the dedicated, talented and committed people who serve as its officers on the Council and committees. It is a feeling at least in a minority of the membership, and perhaps among the others there is even a wider pool of talented potential leaders that might be tapped by the Committees on Committees and by the leadership of this organization. The makers of Proposal 81 are asking for a wider choice at the Convention. It need not be a highly politicized meeting. One can think of other organizations in which such an event was not forthcoming. Is it true that there is a relatively close community of leaders in the NCAA? We have heard from speakers just before that this is not true. Yet the feeling persists that there are other dedicated, talented people who might be invited in ways other than simply a call in The NCAA News. The democratic procedures in this organization, which is a large deliberative body meeting every year, are to the outsiders a sorry tale, and perhaps we could find a slightly better way.

Merrily Dean Baker (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I also stand in support of this amendment. As a United States citizen by birth, I rise in support of the American democratic process as we have practiced it for an awful lot of years. I think tradition speaks to the fact that there are alternate ways of seeking leadership that perhaps are not always as ineffective as some people are concerned about. However, the basic premise that under our democracy and the way in which we live in this country, we have a choice regarding those who will represent us and those who will lead us. I think that all this amendment does is try to preserve that choice, and I for one would like to stand up and say I think we need to preserve that choice. I am less concerned about the mechanics. We do elect officials and representative at all levels of life in this country, whether at a local level, state level or a national level, without having to go through all the hoopla and without all the mechanical concerns that have been expressed here. I think the important thing is the preservation of your rights and my rights to choose who will serve you, who will represent you and who will serve as your leaders. I would ask support for this amendment.

Michael T. Johnson (University of Houston): I have just completed my

second year on the Men's Committee on Committees, and I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. I have found the process to work, in my opinion, very well; and since I must go off that committee very shortly, I have no particular reason to oppose it other than the fact I think it is the wrong way to go. In looking at the roughly 130 candidates we had for, I believe, approximately 24 committees that we were dealing with, I knew probably 20 or 25 of them. The real blessing was that we had some background information that we could read and talk about and at least one or two people on the committee that knew almost everyone. We have a chance to poll and talk to the chairs and the membership of the committees and get some input from them. So it was not a perfect but a fairly informed process. I simply fail to see how this body could possibly do that. Either we take a whole day to have presentations on each candidate or we send out a packet of information that would be unbelievable, or we are going to be in a very haphazard selection process. I suspect that it will become a very haphazard selection process. So, I would urge you to vote against it.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-56) was defeated by all divisions.]

Voting — Ice Hockey

George W. Schubert (University of North Dakota): On behalf of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

Presently in the WCHA only two teams out of eight conference schools may vote on Division I ice hockey matters. I would like to point out, even though making this point, that the University of Wisconsin and the University of Minnesota have represented the eight schools very fairly and we thank them. However, we believe that all ice hockey playing schools, in whatever division they may be in, should have the opportunity to vote on those matters that affect their institution. The proposed resolution will allow those schools that participated in ice hockey in a particular division to vote on ice hockey matters. This proposed resolution is very similar to NCAA Bylaw 10-3-(b), which allows institutions that play football out of their division to vote on football matters in the division in which they participate.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-57) was approved.]

Amendments

Arliss L. Roaden (Tennessee Higher Education Commission): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, this appears to be a relatively minor proposal and indeed it is. Incredibly, the legislation now requires that the Council review and consider at its April, August and October meetings all pieces of proposed legislation whether or not such legislation has the full complement of those who support it, which would cause it to come before this Convention. This matter ought to be one to be considered by the Council as part of its procedures rather than legislation. As one who is leaving the Council at the end of this session, I think that there are two problems that the Council has faced relative to this kind of requirement. One is that it is terribly time consuming to be required to consider all of the pieces of legislation that come before the Council; and, two, I think it impairs the effectiveness of the Council. The Council ought to be in the position of generating its own legislation, reviewing that that has been generated by the Presidents Commission and by the several committees that present leg-

isolation to the Council. For those reasons, I urge that we support Proposal No. 83.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-57) was approved.]

High School or Junior College Representation on Sports Committees

Lewis A. Cryer (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

A year ago we adopted legislation specifying that the NCAA sports committee members who represent high school and junior college interests cannot vote upon issues facing those committees. This is the next logical step in that same vein. This would eliminate high school and junior college representatives as members of the sports committees. It does not seem appropriate to consider persons who are not connected in any way with an NCAA member as full-fledged members have on an NCAA committee; nor does it seem appropriate to continue to pay transportation and per diem for those nonmember representatives to attend sports committee meetings. The high school and junior college interests will be invited to remain somewhat as a liaison with each appropriate committee. That liaison individual can attend the meeting and contribute to the discussions, but it is time to assure that all the members of the NCAA sports committees are representatives of NCAA member institutions or conferences. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 85 (Page A-59) was approved.]

Football Coaching Staff

Frederick H. Dunlap (Colgate University): I move for reconsideration of No. 87, as amended by No. 88.

President Davis: Were you on the prevailing side, sir?

Mr. Dunlap: Yes, I was.

[The motion was seconded.]

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I speak in opposition to reconsideration. Yesterday in the Division I-AA meeting, we passed this; and I did not feel it was a very close vote. I think that in times of economic hardships that we have made our statements. Therefore, I urge nonpassage of reconsideration.

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): This issue was decided in the Division I-AA business session. All debates were heard. It is my understanding that those schools that are disadvantaged by this proposal may introduce legislation next year to address those problems. I ask that the vote to reconsider be defeated.

Frederick H. Dunlap (Colgate University): I would like to ask for it to be reconsidered on the grounds that the impact it will have on the JV programs. At the time that the discussion was held, I failed to realize that it would impact the part-time assistants in a program that coach our JV programs and programs where we have walk-on athletes, squads that number 120 to 125 players. This effectively removes that part-time coach who handles this type of staff. We have legislation here for the larger schools that can get graduate assistants, and we also have provided in Proposal No. 88 for those schools that have freshman programs and JV programs to coach them with part-time assistants. We have given them additional assistants for both of these staffs. However, the teams that may have a JV squad that plays six or seven games and a varsity squad,

there is no provision for them to have part-time assistants. That is the reason I would like to ask for reconsideration. I failed to realize that. At the meeting last evening, I learned there were many other schools that also have the same problem. We did not realize that at the time of the voting.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 87 (Page A-59) was defeated.]

Limitations on Playing Seasons and Number of Contests

Eric Hyman (Virginia Military Institute): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hyman: I move this proposal be referred to the Council for further study.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-61) was referred to the Council.]

Contest Limits — Fund-Raising Activities

L.O. Morgan (University of Texas, Austin): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year, when we put contest limits in all sports, we inadvertently cut off some activities that I think many of us are very interested in and excited about. Up to this year, our student-athletes have always been permitted to play against alumni scholarship-fund raisers in tennis and golf benefits, softball games and similar activities. This is not trying to introduce something new; it is something we have had for a long, long time and many people were interested in it. Our athletes have and should be encouraged to lend their assistance to local charities, parks and community by participating in fund raising athletics by playing in local celebrity sports events. I urge your support for Proposal 92.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-63) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Limitations on Playing Seasons

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): On behalf of the Western Athletic Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would amend Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(5) of the NCAA Manual, which defines and limits playing seasons. It would allow all sports, including football, to observe the same starting date and to use the same definition and parameters for term traditional fall season. Last January at the annual NCAA Convention, we passed legislation whereby the date for the first permissible contest in the sport of football was changed and clarified. Proposal No. 93 disallows legislation passed in 1985 to apply to other NCAA approved fall sports. Proposal No. 93 is simple and straightforward. The intent is as follows: Part A defines the first permissible playing date. When September first falls on a Sunday or a Monday, the first contest may be played on a Saturday or a Sunday, that Saturday or Sunday preceding that date of September first. Passing this legislation would allow all fall sports, including football, to have the same permissible date for the first contest. Part B of this amendment clarifies and slightly changes the definition of the term "traditional fall season" by using the same language contained in Part A; namely, if September first falls on a Sunday or a Monday the first contest may be played on the Saturday or Sunday

immediately preceding September first. Once again, this legislation will just make the language for all traditional fall sports consistent. It will do nothing more. Amendment 93 appears to be noncontroversial and we solicit your support.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-64) was approved (Part A by Divisions I and II, Part B by all divisions).]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

D.J. DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Conference): I would like to move, in behalf of the NCAA Council, the adoption of Proposal 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, housekeeping in nature, will clarify that a conference championship tournament or meets, or the tournament used to determine the automatic qualifiers of sports need not be conducted at the end of a regular season in order to be counted as only one contest. The adoption of No. 94 would not change the manner in which conference scores are currently counted against a permissible number of contests. For example, in basketball, the conference tournament would continue to be counted as one and all other sports would continue to be excluded. Under the current legislation, if an institution conducts any contests after its conference tournament, those contests played in the tournament each count against the number allowable. If Proposal No. 94 is adopted, institutions would have the flexibility to schedule after this championship tournament.

[Proposal No. 94 (Page A-64) was approved (Part A by all divisions, Part B by Divisions I and II).]

Postseason Football Contests

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): Mr. President, on behalf of the Penn State Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation affects only two conferences in the country, the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association where due to its 14-member size determine the football champion with a final championship game. The problem is that current legislation dictates that all conference members may schedule only 10 contests on their football schedules. Consequently, only two institutions play 11 games and 80 percent of our conferences are dictated to 10 or less. The passage of No. 95 allows these institutions to schedule 11 football contests; and then as we have been advised require these conferences to apply to the Postseason Football Committee for a 12th championship game. It seems appropriate to point out that currently with the 18 Division I-A postseason bowl games, 12 qualifiers for Division I-AA play-offs, eight qualifiers for Division II play-offs and the 16 qualifiers for the Division III play-offs, that 68 institutions played 12 football games this past season. 20 teams played 13 games and eight teams played 14 games. In fact, 14 actually played 15 football games this past year.

Consequently, there appears to be no educational or administrative rationale of the current legislation that limits 24 universities to only 10 contests. What this legislation accomplishes is to correct the current injustice to the 24 Division II institutions limited to only 10 contests per year. I repeat this, it only affects two Division II conferences in the country, and in no way is it intended to proliferate the number of bowl contests. Therefore, we urge your support to

give approval for these institutions who presently only have 10 contests.

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): The Postseason Football Committee voted to oppose this proposal. We would like to have you vote against it.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I cannot believe that. This only affects two conferences as Dick Yoder said. You are restricting 20 some schools to playing 10 football games, and at this time where money is needed in all institutions it is very vital that we are permitted to play 11 games conference-wise and only four teams will be restricted to 12 games. We strongly urge your support.

Irv Hess (Kutztown University of Pennsylvania): I would like Mr. Lude to explain why they did not see fit in their minds to sponsor this legislation.

Mr. Lude (University of Washington): It was the feeling of the Postseason Football Committee that it was a 12th game and an opportunity to expand on the 11-game schedule. We just did not think it was in the best interest of inter-collegiate football.

William D. Bradford, M.D. (Duke University): I just would like to remind everybody that we are working on a resolution that was passed by the Presidents Commission, 429-3, I believe a year ago, to maintain a moratorium on increasing the number of contests. I do not oppose these conference activities, but I would move to refer this amendment to the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to refer failed.]

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-65) was approved.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The difficulty we have is that last year when limitations were placed upon state meets and a variety of other descriptions, there were misunderstandings amongst those who worked on the limitation for skiing. The effect that we now have is that our skiing season has been cut virtually into one-half because of the manner in which it was stated in the legislation. We have different skiers on different dates during a ski meet, which is normally two days. To count each day as a contest would virtually destroy our skiing programs. This is not increasing what we have done traditionally but is an effort to maintain what we thought we would have by way of a skiing season.

Denis E. Lambert (University of Vermont): We are acutely aware of the concerns of the presidents about lengthening seasons. As Joe indicated, it is not the intention of lengthening something that we thought we had last year. As a chair of the Men's and Women's Skiing Committee, we feel very strongly that this should be supported. Not only the committee, which represents the broad sector of the skiing community, but also the Eastern Ski Intercollegiate Association also strongly supports this. We have had a hard time over the year trying to find close cooperation between the United States Skiing Association and collegiate skiing. With the type of people like Bill Marolt, who is now athletics director at Colorado, and Jim Page, who is the director of skiing, former Dartmouth coach, and so forth, we have good working relations. The current limitations really affect us badly. Also what happens in the skiing is that we are competing both men and women at the same contest, and it makes it extremely difficult when we do not control the facilities. It is very important that we have

this legislation passed.

Bill Marolt (University of Colorado): While I was the director of our Olympic efforts in 1980 and 1984, it was very clear to me that intercollegiate skiing was an integral part of our international skiing effort, both in terms of the development of athletes and the development of coaches. For this and for the reasons already given, I urge the support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-66) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Carl F. Ullrich (U.S. Military Academy): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

Although I have great concern for Mr. Ryan's comments yesterday, and in my own thoughts on the Council's attitude toward this particular matter as Mr. Bradford just expressed them. I think it is important that we right what was perhaps a wrong in a number of out-of-season contests that we set for the particular sports. The popularity of this sport is given a number of opportunities outside the institutional guidance and control, and a number of our student-athletes are participating in those. By passing this piece of legislation, we can regain control of the situation and have our athletes participating in competition that we actually have some control over.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, I would rise to speak against this amendment. First of all, this is because of the fact what we are going from is not the six contests or 11 contests, but from six dates to 11 dates which may make two or three, there could be as many as 33 soccer contests. I have seen it happen on our campus on a given date. Secondly, we passed the traditional fall season last year for soccer as we have an additional season in other sports, and now are moving to a year-round sport. Thirdly, we have the most confusing rule on postseason competition in soccer anyway because we have one point in the rule on Page 83 where it says there shall be no postseason practice and another which says you cannot have a contest until after the final day of the academic year. Finally, I think that we have had 400 speakers say in all due respect to the presidents. We finally should listen to the presidents and vote something down.

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): Pardon me, Roy, but I am going to excuse myself from the intent of President Ryan and the Council's intention. I fully support this idea. Unfortunately, though, having been chair of the committee that brought about the limitations of playing seasons, the number of conferences, dates, and so forth, and also having chaired the last two meetings of this body, attempts of the soccer coaches and administrators who were interested in increasing from six to 11 the number of date opportunities have been denied because we have not had time to consider those things in the previous two Conventions. So their intent and purposes preceded the Special Convention. They did not have notice that the Presidents Commission and the Council were going to ask for a moratorium. They have complete respect for that idea. However, they do want to place in today's record the following statement: The limitations of six contests has been driving soccer players who are playing year-round in that sport, who are very much involved in practicing their sport year-round, to go downtown and to join club teams when their own practice opportunities ceases. The coaches are extremely worried about infractions and other things that are entering into this sport when their team is not practicing on the campus. They are interested in increasing from six to 11 for

the purpose of having at least one day a week during each semester where they can have their kids on campus for the whole time and not looking to spend more money or abuse the intent and purposes of the limitation. Whether we turn this down today or not, I hope certainly we will consider this as we consider all of the things that we referred in this regard for further study.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): Mr. President, I appreciate the support of Mr. Toner and others. As a soccer-playing institution with a great division in soccer, we feel it is very important for the development of intercollegiate soccer that an appropriate number of out-of-season dates be allowed. Our issue today is not the increase of something preestablished, because this year is the first year those dates have been established. We really have not even entered into that experience yet. We can already see on the horizon the problems that have been described here today. The student-athletes in our institutions are being forced outside of the institutional control and forced to compete outside of the coverage and the umbrella of our medical coverage and our institutional insurance programs simply to play outside the intercollegiate umbrella. We feel that is not wholesome for intercollegiate soccer and not in the best interest of the development of the intercollegiate soccer sport.

Merrily Dean Baker (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Given knowledge of the growth of the sport of soccer in this country and given the legislation that we have passed this morning, and given the previous speakers' comments, I am led to ask a question from someone in the soccer community, please, and that is this: Does passage or would passage of this piece of legislation lead to the request for naming indoor soccer as a separate sport?

Jeffrey Vennell (Kenyon College): No.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): Mr. Chair, does this legislation apply to both men's and women's soccer? It would appear to just as drafted.

President Davis: Yes, it does.

Ralph Barkley (Sonoma State University): I would ask the Division II people to think very carefully about passing this. We have two immediate problems in our conference, and we have a lot of dual sports athletes involved in soccer in the fall and involved in a variety of sports in the spring. Many of us and many of you out there have part-time soccer coaches; and if you put them into an 11-contest season in the spring, you are asking them to go year-round and you are asking athletes to make a decision whether they are going to go into a spring sport and lose some ground with their soccer team or stay with the soccer team all season. At our level, Division II, I do not think that either one of those is reasonable.

John W. Ryan (Indiana University, Bloomington): I hesitated to come to the microphone to speak to this proposal, but I feel I must because of the instruction from the Presidents Commission. First, I want to say how pleased I think the members of the Commission would be that we have adopted a new preface to almost any statement on these issues, which is: As devoted as we are to the recommendations of the Presidents Commission, we still feel A, B, C, D or E. That is a very warm feeling that I will carry back to the members of the Presidents Commission. (Laughter)

While I speak with levity, I do mean that. It is reassuring to know that the delegates of this Convention have in mind the important problem for the Association of dealing with limitations on expansion of seasons, numbers of tests and so on. Mr. President, I am not going to speak for or against this proposal as I did not yesterday when I raised the same issue in the Division I meeting. I

would like to simply urge every member who will vote on this or subsequent proposals to keep in mind two things. It was not the Presidents Commission but this Convention or a convention of delegates of this Association in June that by resolution requested the Council and the Presidents Commission to consider this problem and to come forward with recommendations for action after such consideration, and that consideration is underway. The second point I would like to make is that the moratorium is intended to protect the interests of the sport and those interested in the sport concerned in several of these proposals. Because of the resolution in June, I am sure that any reservation whatsoever about bringing forward a recommendation if that is where our study comes out, to curtail what may be given in this Convention or may have been given in an earlier Convention. Now, I think that such *caveat emptor* is not necessary, but I feel better having said it because the study is going to proceed, the moratorium is being vacated not by the Council and not by the Commission. If it is vacated, it will be vacated by this Convention. That is fine as long as we bear in mind that the study will proceed and recommendations may come forward.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-66) failed in Divisions I and II.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal comes about simply because we have a problem with softball and double elimination in tournaments. At the present time, softball has maximum contest limits per season. Most teams play double-elimination tournaments during their year. Scheduling becomes a nightmare when teams are unable to exactly predict the number of contests to be played in these tournaments. It would be possible that an institution would be forced to cancel several softball games at the end of the year if their team happened to have dropped to the loser bracket early in some double-elimination tournaments. To eliminate the possibility that a team could schedule an unlimited number of double-elimination tournaments and thus greatly increase the number of games it could play, this amendment would allow the maximum of 10 such tournaments. The intent is not to greatly increase the maximum of teams the team may play since the teams could play only two games and be eliminated in one of the tournaments. Rather the intent is to aid scheduling double-elimination tournaments.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-66) was approved by Division I (146-94); defeated in Division II (65-93).]

Permissible Expenses — Athletics Career Counseling

Bob Moorman (Central Athletic Association): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is intended to permit a little more flexibility on your panels when you are discussing the potentials of your student-athlete. We feel that it is necessary to have an individual that has the background of the physical education aspect of the program. It also permits institutional counseling panels to be comprised of more than three members, and we strongly suggest approval.

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-69) was approved.]

Amateurism — Agents

Bob Moorman (Central Athletic Association): I move adoption on behalf of the NCAA Council of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is somewhat of a companion proposal. What this offers the student-athlete and the counciling panel to do is to discuss with the professional football or professional basketball, or whatever it be, the potential contract of the student-athlete. Now, this was discussed and approved in the last meeting of the Special Committee on Player Agents. I strongly suggest approval.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-70) was approved.]

Drug Rehabilitation Expenses

William D. Bradford, M.D. (Duke University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal merely permits the member institutions to pay drug rehabilitation expenses for the student-athletes. This is in keeping with our program with drug education, testing and rehabilitation.

Steven Danish (Virginia Commonwealth University): After my opposition to No. 30, you would think I would be in favor of this; but I am not. I want to tell you why. The professional literature on substantive use is very clear. The focus on prevention is much more effective and cost efficient than is a focus on treatment. If the purpose of the drug-testing program was because of a concern for the health and welfare of the student-athletes, we have a problem. Prevention through fear is not a great deterrent. Most of us do drive over 55 miles per hour. Prevention by education and adding that to fear has some extra value. Therefore, the NCAA pamphlet on drug education is of value. However, most of us know about the effects of overeating, smoking and drunk driving, yet many do it. These consequences are greater than being declared ineligible at least for most players and coaches. On a broad-based program, which includes education and skill, training, in other words, teaching people how to make decisions about not taking drugs, is an overall part of the drug-education program. We are having a problem. Now, what kind of implications does this have for 107? Why put money into a program that in part is caused by the lack of foresight and planning on the part of the institution? In other words, not having an integral and strong drug-education program as part of their drug testing program. Second, student services and counseling standards at most institutions can help people who have drug problems. Students who have more serious problems that must be hospitalized may be able to use student insurance. If schools had extra money to put into such programs as drug rehabilitation, we might better think of a fifth-year financing or career counseling as proposed in the next proposal. In this way, you are developing programs for the majority of the student-athletes and not the minority of student-athletes who will experience serious drug problems.

Mr. Bradford: I would just like to remind the Convention this is a basic part of the entire drug program and is the element of education and screening.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): I can also remember this is permissive legislation. If an institution does not believe in the concept of drug rehabilitation, it certainly does not have to engage in it. It would be strange indeed a Convention that we would have a regulation that would allow us to furnish contact lenses for athletes that we can now do and not furnish drug

rehabilitation.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I find it rather strange, although I support it (Item No. 107), I find it rather strange that we will not provide medical assistance for appendicitis, pregnancies, measles and a lot of other illnesses that our student-athletes may encounter. However, we are prepared to help with drug-rehabilitation expenses. I would like to inquire of the committee whether it did a cost study on the rehabilitation of substance abuses, since I see in the media expenses of \$5,000 to \$10,000 per individual for drug rehabilitation. Therefore, I would recommend that you vote against No. 107.

John J. Crouthamel (Syracuse University): Mr. President, I find it a little discomforting that the presenter of the motion suggested that we are merely addressing the opportunity to provide rehabilitation. That is a rather significant undertaking as Frank Rienzo just suggested. I am curious that some people may seem to be thinking that term rehabilitation means one thing and another another thing. Can we have a clarification or definition of what rehabilitation is suggesting? If it is providing counseling, then I could support it wholeheartedly. If we are going beyond counseling, I would have a great deal of difficulty with it.

Leo C. VanderBeek (Western Michigan University): Responsibility for rehabilitation is not something that we can say is ours or is not ours; because even if we do not do anything about it, it is still our responsibility. We cannot bring in appendicitis and we cannot bring in pregnancies. Those events, the sufferer is the pregnant person, the family, the person that has appendicitis. But if we do not do anything about the person that is addicted to drugs, the price to society is paid over and over and over again. That price to society is much, much greater than the price of rehabilitation. We have this in the armed forces. The question comes up at the university in course work and courses, prior health problems, whose responsibility is it? Do we help the individual in rehabilitation? The answer is yes. If it comes back again, do we do it a second time? The answer is yes.

President Davis: Mr. Crouthamel, I will try to respond to the question that you raised. It is my understanding that one of the major reasons for the proposal was that although there are drug-rehabilitation programs on many campuses for students, the unique position of student-athletes often precludes their using campus facilities for students. The student-athlete is in an extremely difficult position because of the knowledge that that person is a student-athlete. Therefore, this was proposed to provide the opportunity for an institution to provide proper drug rehabilitation essentially at the same expense that your campus would provide for other students, which is primarily counseling on drug abuse. It would be somewhat restricted to that but would follow the same scope as medical attention on counseling available to other students on the campus, but probably in no greater degree than that.

Mr. Crouthamel: Do we assume a suggestion, then, that by the fact this is permissive legislation, as I understand, once we assume the responsibility, it seems to me that we cannot overlook the responsibility once we get involved in the whole drug-testing program. We assume responsibility on a lifetime basis as a potential?

President Davis: Not at all. You do not assume that.

Mr. Crouthamel: But it is possible to assume that responsibility on a lifetime basis?

President Davis: It is possible to assume giving money to anybody on a life-

time basis, Jake. This refers to the constitutional limitation on financial aid and benefits to student-athletes who have eligibility.

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): It was the committee's intent to not harness and limit member institutions that at the current time have no choice. They just cannot supply drug rehabilitation under our restrictions, under our financial aid legislation. We feel it is incumbent upon any program of testing at NCAA championships, postseason football events, that the institutions involved with a drug positive case would have the freedom under our rules to pursue rehabilitation if they chose to. That is the morality behind the rationale; and yes, there are evidences of how far one might have to go into the rehabilitation process. We at least ought to let our member institutions have a beginning.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-70) was approved.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Stewart P. Haskell Jr. (University of Maine, Orono): As one that voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 98, I would like to ask for reconsideration by the Division I schools on this issue.

[The motion was seconded.]

My concern is that we could play three games. We must have 27 games and play 27 to qualify for NCAA championships. We could play three games on a date, we could do that several times, and that would only count as one contest. My concern is that in the Northern region it would almost make it impossible for many of us to qualify and get enough games in to meet the 27-game requirement. On the other hand, I would have no objection to this legislation if the Council could see fit that we could count it as three games if we played three on those dates for NCAA championship requirements. If that were the case, then I have no objection. Otherwise, I do see a very serious problem for us in the Northern region.

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): As one of the sponsors of this legislation, it is my understanding that the intent of the legislation is exactly as the previous speaker has spoken. We would not count a tournament as one, but each day that a team played as one. Therefore, the team could play two games in one day and one the next day, and that would still count as two, but it would get in the requirements the previous speaker is trying to accomplish for NCAA qualifications.

Sarah E. Hill (Florida A&M University): I speak in opposition to this motion. For some institutions in the South, it makes it very difficult for us to make a trip on a one-to-one basis that would incur a lot of traveling; and it costs money in order for us to make those kinds of trips. If we are able to play in separate tournaments, it would help us to meet the requirements and in addition to that it would keep most of our students from missing class as much as it would if we were limited in the number of tournaments that we can play. I am concerned on both sides, that we would have the opportunity to play as many tournaments as we can in order to meet the requirements. Most of us do not have the budgets to travel back and forth for the competitions that would only give us one or maybe two games. I speak in opposition to this.

Stewart P. Haskell Jr. (University of Maine, Orono): The intent says, "To specify that each date of the softball tournament shall be counted as one game." If you are located in the Northern part of the country, in the spring of the year, at best you have four to five weekends. In order to get our 27 games in and out of softball counted as one of our six sports, at least in Division I-AA, of

which many of us are members, we have to utilize every weekend. On those weekends we have tournaments. If we play three games on a Friday and three games on a Saturday, or three games on a Saturday and three games on a Sunday, that is six games out of 27 and we are able to meet the minimum standard. But if it only counts two days out of the 27, then you have to schedule more games during the week and get the kids out of class more often, which makes it difficult to keep softball as a countable Division I sport. To me, this legislation really does not make too much sense if we are trying to do what is best in the interest of student-athletes.

Richard Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I would like to ask for clarification from the chair. It seems to me that is listed or entitled limitations on number of contests. It seems to me the intent was that it be counted as one game for the purposes of the maximum number that can be played. But that is not to be counted as a single game for record purposes. Can you give us a ruling on that?

President Davis: That is correct. The purpose of No. 98 is to limit in the sport of softball a tournament to be counted as one contest, the date of the tournament counted as one date for limitation of 10 such tournaments. That is not related to the requirements of Bylaw 11 for sports sponsorship. Each contest will count as one of the 27 contests required for the sports sponsorship in Division I.

[The motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Permissible Expenses — Career Counseling

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

As chair of the Special NCAA Committee to Measure Athletic Performance, at least success that is structured to recognize those institutions in the future that are and will in the future provide special programs for their student-athletes regarding student development, career counseling, it was discovered that these types of programs are in violation unless we add to the identified benefits, 3-1-(h)-(4), along with the tutoring expenses, medical expenses; career counseling for professional sports which represents about one or two percent of our student-athletes; and other self-development career counseling programs for the other 98 and 99 percent. I urge you to vote for this amendment that would involve such programs as drug education, which if you are using those programs at this point you are in violation. The problems of gambling, to bring an FBI agent into your program to speak to our players, you are in violation; motivational speakers, career counseling, et cetera. This in time may become the most important bit of legislation in our history. I urge you to vote for Proposition No. 108. Thank you.

Jack H. Friedenthal (Stanford University): I oppose No. 108. In the first place, I do not quite understand what "on-campus student development and career counseling utilizing sources from outside the institution" really means. To me, I can see a group of boosters sitting around with the football players and saying, "Okay, do not worry about classes. Your career lies on the field. You just do your best, and we will take care of you." I am afraid for all of those of us who are in major schools, and most of the minor schools, we have career counseling centers for all our students. We do not need special treatment for athletes in this regard. We already have special treatment with respect to those matters that deal with professional contracts. That is related to student-ath-

letes that is fine. The rest of the benefits are too special and is the kind of thing we have avoided all the way along. Do everything for all of your students the same way.

Mr. Rice: I am very disappointed in that remark, because there are probably institutions in violation right now. I am sure they have had speakers on their campuses in many of these areas. We are talking about drug education. We are talking about gambling. We are talking about career opportunities. And I know each institution has this service on their campus. Why do we have two, why do we have special programs and tutors for our athletes now? That is because they are special individuals. They have a different time schedule. They are regimented to all these programs. We expect an awful lot out of these people. We need to look into this area. It is a very positive approach. It is not a negative approach as this past speaker has alluded to. I do not think that he completely understands what we are trying to do for young people in these programs.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Two points in support of this proposal. First, many of our student-athletes are unable to assess campus career programs due to their academic and practice schedules occurring during the 8:00 to 5:00 hours when they are available. Second, research shows that structured career counseling programs result in improved academic performance. We should be in favor of such.

D.J. DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I am speaking in support of this item because of an interpretation that was given that we invited an outside speaker on drug and alcohol education to arrive at the campus. He is from outside the institution, arrives on campus to give a presentation, and that was declared unauthorized and illegal. This language, my understanding of it, was housekeeping in nature.

Paul F. Dietzel (Samford University): I do not know of any coach in the United States who has not in the last 15 years had an FBI man come out and speak to his squad on gambling and on dope — this has been going on for years and years — I have never heard of any of them being paid. It is always someone volunteering. Of course, if you are in a smaller school such as Samford, I think we have a tendency to have a lot of opportunities to talk to these athletes.

If we are not interested in their further career, you are getting this a little out of kilter because basically this is designed to help the student and not to give anyone downtown an advantage and certainly not to do anything that would be illegal as far as boosters and so forth. I do not think boosters have anything to do with this.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-71) was approved.]

Sports Festival Tryout Expenses

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): On behalf of the sponsoring institutions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is again permissive legislation to allow member institutions to pay the expenses of eligible student-athletes to participate in official tryouts for the USOC National Sports Festival tryouts. This would apply and is needed for team sports such as basketball and volleyball.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I understand some of the sports such as basketball and volleyball have a specific tryout. I am concerned about some of the other NGB's that select their teams for the sports festival in a different way. One sport, for instance, does it through its develop-

mental program in the summer that involves several levels of camp attendance. Currently, institutions are prohibited from funding their student-athletes to those camps in the summer. However, under this legislation I am wondering if we would look at that entire process as being a portion of the selection process for the sports festival team in which case the institutions could fund the entire teams to three levels of camps?

President Davis: Personally, the U.S. Olympic Committee, if they define their trial process as including the sports camps and as a part of this process, then this would be considered as a tryout in the definition of the legal amendment. If it was a tryout that was not an integral part of the system as defined by the Olympic Committee, then it would not provide for expenses to be paid.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Just to help a little bit in providing some information, that determination is not that of the United States Olympic Committee but by the national governing body. For instance, in basketball, we determine how we are going to run our tryouts. In field hockey, as Sharon was just referring to, they do have these camps. We conduct them on our campus. So it is a problem in some sports.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-71) was defeated.]

Commercial Logos

Nancy O'Connor (Colorado State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the sponsoring institutions, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment would only expand the allowable list of items commonly worn by athletes. The restrictions that are in effect now would be required for the additional items. These items are worn by most of our athletes, and it is very difficult to secure most of them generically.

Stanley J. Clark (California State University, Hayward): Mr. President, on behalf of the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association, we ask for your approval of this proposition. The restriction against socks, head bands, hats and so on have represented tremendous problems when we conduct national tennis championships. Even the assistant director of championships representing the NCAA, has gone on record as stating that it is almost impossible to enforce these things. The passage of this proposition would eliminate the problems while the same restrictions still apply with the size logo.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I speak as secretary-rules editor of the Men's Basketball Rules Committee, Mr. President. This amendment speaks to a complete contradiction to the men's basketball playing rules. If this amendment were to pass, the Convention would be getting into the business of writing playing rules, which, Mr. President, in my view is unconstitutional. The Basketball Men's Rules Committee urges the defeat of this proposition.

Donna L. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I have a question. Would the basketball rules supersede this rule, the rules of this sport?

President Davis: This is a case that refers to a constitution provision that restricts on behalf of the membership the article that may be worn by athletes. It would override the rules of play in any particular sport. This would be something that the membership could adopt and could supersede the rules of play for our student-athletes.

Ms. Donna Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Does that really make sense? Could not the rules prohibit the use of a knee brace in a particular situation, someone wearing a knee brace with a logo, even if it were permitted, would not be able to wear that by the rules?

President Davis: If you wrote knee braces into this legislation that would be the case.

Douglas Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. President, I do not understand the previous colloquy. This simply says that a person has not professionalized himself or herself by wearing certain types of apparel. It certainly does not mandate that this type of apparel be worn. It contravenes. It is permissible legislation. If it contravenes the playing rules, my understanding would be simply that the playing rules, which you say you may not wear something simply because it does not make you a professional, go out the window. Is that not right?

President Davis: This is not in conflict with the playing rules. This simply says that a student-athlete who does wear uniforms that exceed the limitations identified and proposed here would be in violation of the NCAA rules.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-72) was defeated (343-205); two-thirds majority required.]

President Davis: Let us turn to No. 111. In the handout that you had on amendments, No. 111 was withdrawn. But let me give you the reasons why it was withdrawn so that you all go away from the Convention with the same information. No. 111 is a staff interpretation and not really Council interpretation. A staff interpretation of Case No. 186 that was developed at the request of a large number of member institutions that prohibits an institution from buying or arranging space in game programs or other printed materials such as periodicals relating to recruiting for any purpose. The last sentence was the key sentence in the staff interpretation, because the prohibition, according to the staff interpretation, would extend to advertisements regarding member institution's summer camps or clinics as well as to their overall athletic program. The Council, in recognizing some of the questions that were raised about the legitimate advertisements of institution's summer camps, adopted prior to the Convention a change in the staff interpretation. It would add to what you have there the following language. I will read you the last sentence, and then I will read to you the addition. I mention this now because some of you may be considering advertising your institution's summer camps at this time.

The last sentence would then read, "This prohibition would extend to advertisements regarding member institutions' summer camps or clinics, unless the periodical includes the camp directory in which the size and format of such advertisement placed by any member institution is the same." So if in that periodical or game program, or whatever, there is a camp directory similar to the directory of consultants that appears in professional journals, if there is that, then that will be permissible. We will put this language in it and the new interpretation in the legislative assistance column in The NCAA News. Since this matter was brought to your attention, we thought we might advise you of it now.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

[Note: The delegates heard reports and approved the slate of candidates from the Men's Committee on Committees, the Women's Committees on Committees and Nominating Committee was approved.]

President Davis: I wish to comment briefly on the major focus and efforts of your Association during the coming year and certainly encourage your interest and your participation in any of these activities. First of all, the NCAA Presidents Commission plans at its meeting in April 1986 to address the issues of major interest to the membership, specifically the federated Association,

including specific voting privileges; financial aid limitations and cost containment, and continuous concerns regarding integrity, including academic issues. Those actions will be extremely vital to the continued success of this Association. Secondly, Secretary-Treasurer Wil Bailey's Committee on Deregulation and Simplification should complete most of its important work this year, and we should be in a position at the next Convention, or during 1987, to present to the membership a major work on revising the Manual. Of almost equal importance is Homer Rice's Committee on Measuring Athletics Programs Success — a program leading to identifying all that is good about athletics. That committee will conclude most of its work this year.

Lastly, the NCAA program of corporate sponsorship has substantially improved our ability to support programs for youth. This next year, we will see not only a continuation in strengthening the National Youth Sports Program but the introduction of Youth Sports Clinics and expanding drug education. This has been a real year of accomplishment for the organization, and I invite your interest during the next year in all of these.

Thanks for your attention during this Convention.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

Appendix A

80th Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1985-86 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 80th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 80th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Proposal Numbers	General Topic
1 through 2	Consent—Constitution and Special Rules
3 through 13	Consent—Bylaws and Other
14 through 18	Academics
19 through 21	Presidents Commission Grouping
22 through 29	Financial Aid
30 through 39	General
40 through 54	Recruiting
55 through 67	Membership and Classification
68 through 79	Eligibility
80 through 86	Governance
87 through 90	Personnel
91 through 104	Playing and Practice Seasons
105 through 110	Amateurism

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

Proposals 1 and 2 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional and other amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

NO. 1 NCAA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a)-(3), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Among those ~~12~~ nine members, ~~eight~~ seven shall represent Division I members, including at least two women and the division vice-

president and including **five** **four** members representing Division I-A football, two members representing Division I-AA football and one member representing *institutions that do not sponsor football in Division I-AAA*; two one shall represent Division II members, *including the division vice-president*, and **two** **one** shall represent Division III members, *including the division vice-president*. At least one woman shall be included among the Division II or Division III members (**including the division vice-presidents**).

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exclude the division vice-presidents from consideration in the numerical representation requirements for the NCAA Executive Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 1 and 2 were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package.

NO. 2 DIVISION BUSINESS SESSIONS

Special Rules of Order: Amend Section 2-(a) and (b), page 165, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The programs of *the round tables and of the business sessions* of an annual or special Convention of the Association shall be established by the Council, acting as the convention program committee. Once adopted by a majority vote of the Convention, the order of business established in the program may be changed or suspended only by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting.

"(b) An annual or special Convention may include separate division *round tables business sessions* to discuss matters of interest to the members of each division, **to act upon legislation in accordance with the constitution** and to act upon division membership criteria waiver requests under the provisions of the bylaws. In addition to the division *round tables business sessions*, a general round table may be held to enable the membership to discuss matters of general interest. Legislation shall be acted upon only at the Convention business sessions in accordance with the constitution and bylaws."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To change the names of the division meetings at NCAA Conventions from round tables to business sessions and to conform the special rules of order to the amendment to Constitution 5-7-(e) adopted at the 1985 Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

Consent Package—Bylaws, Other

Proposals 3 through 12 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaws and executive regulations considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item

contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

NO. 3 RECRUITING—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4-(b), page 59, as follows:

[Division I-A only]

"(b) The head football coach of a Division I-A member institution shall not be present when an off-campus site is utilized for purposes of obtaining a prospective student-athlete's **signature on a National Letter of Intent** or signed acceptance of the institution's *written offer of admission as a student or conference's financial aid statement* or written tender of financial assistance to be provided on the prospect's enrollment."

Source: NCAA Council (all nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference).

Intent: To affirm that a Division I-A head football coach cannot be present at an off-campus site for the signing of a National Letter of Intent or the acceptance of an athletics grant-in-aid to be provided upon enrollment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 3 through 12 approved as a bylaw and other legislation consent package.

NO. 4 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 309, following Bylaw 3-3-(c), page 82, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"O.I. 309. A 'postseason tournament' contest in basketball is one between teams that are not identified until the close of the preceding regular season, the term 'postseason' necessarily implying that the time of the event shall be after a regular season. If a conference conducts a regularly scheduled, season-end, single-elimination **basketball** tournament (which may include one additional contest to determine third place) among some or all of its members, the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible regular-season contests as specified in this section and the tournament shall not be considered postseason. **In all sports other than football**, institutions that tie for a conference championship may participate in a single-elimination play-off to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament without the game or games being counted as a regular-season contest or postseason tournament."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that in all sports other than football, play-offs between or among conference members that tie for a conference championship may take place to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA championship without the contests being counted against the maximum limitation on contests in that sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 5 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(d), page 82, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

(d) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport shall exclude competition in one conference season-end tournament, **the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) championships** and the **NCAA championships**. In the sports of indoor and outdoor track and field, the limitations shall exclude competition in one conference season-end meet, **the NAIA championships** and the **NCAA championships** in each sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exempt contests or dates of competition in championships conducted by the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) from counting toward the maximum limitations in Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 6 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 92-93, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a **successfully completed** core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that a student must complete satisfactorily each course used to meet the core-curriculum requirements in order to be considered a 2.000 qualifier, regardless of the student's accumulative grade-point average in the core-curriculum courses or performance on the standardized tests.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 7 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(14)-(vi), page 102, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

(vi) If the student transfers to the certifying institution from a Division III member institution and meets the above conditions, he or she may be eligible to compete but shall not receive *institutionally administered athletically related* financial aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To clarify that an institution may not award athletically related financial aid during the first academic year in residence to a transfer student from a Division III institution who is otherwise eligible under Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 8 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(2), pages 142-143, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

(2) The institution's team, in individual sports, shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest for it to be counted. The following minimums are applicable:

Men's Fencing	5
Women's Fencing	3"

Source: NCAA Council (Women's Fencing Committee).

Intent: To establish a minimum number of participants in each contest in women's fencing in order to count the sport toward meeting the minimum sports sponsorship criteria for women's programs in Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 9 GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, pages 147-153, by deleting subparagraph (l), relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(l) *The Governmental Affairs Committee shall consist of five members of the Council, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated. It shall be responsible for reviewing current and proposed Federal and state legislation that might affect intercollegiate athletics and periodically shall report its findings and recommendations to the Council.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To abolish the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 10 PROFESSIONAL SPORTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(u), page 151, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(u) The Professional Sports Liaison Committee shall consist of **six** **eight** members, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and **two** **four** unallocated, and including conference commissioners experienced in a broad range of intercollegiate sports *and*, at least one director of athletics at a Division I-A football institution, a **representative of the American Football Coaches Association** and a **representative of the National Association of Basketball Coaches**. It shall study and make recommendations to the Council concerning the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and professional teams and organizations."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Intent: To increase the membership of the Professional Sports Liaison Committee from six to eight by adding representatives of the American Football Coaches Association and the National Association of Basketball Coaches.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 11 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(x), page 152, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(x) The Research Committee shall consist of **seven** **nine** members, including at least **three** **two** faculty athletics representatives, at least **two** **one** directors of athletics *and*, one experienced in research methods, and **two** **experienced in academic tests and measurements**. **Two** **Three** positions shall be allocated for men, **two** **three** for women and three unallocated. The committee shall evaluate, supervise and coordinate the Association's research activities; make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding expenditures of Association funds for research projects, and make recommendations to the Council concerning research topics in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Research Committee).

Intent: To increase the membership of the Research Committee from seven to nine by adding two individuals experienced in academic tests and measurements, and to adjust other requirements on the committee as specified.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 12 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(g), page 155, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) At least one representative from each of the *following* geographic regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5, and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8; **four men's gymnastics regions plus two representatives elected at large**.

"(2) Three members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II, one member shall be from Division III and one member shall be elected at large."

[Delete subparagraph (3), which no longer is necessary in light of the provisions of Bylaw 12-4-(a)-(3), and renumber subparagraphs (4) and (5), which remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee).

Intent: To require the selection of at least one committee member from each of the four men's gymnastics regions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 3.

NO. 13 ADMINISTRATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1, pages 167-168, by adding new paragraph (d), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All division, common vote]

"(d) If a division championship has been established in a sport, the intercollegiate teams in that sport sponsored by institutions in the division that has the separate division championship shall not be counted for the purpose of meeting the minimum sponsorship percentages set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a)-(1) and 1-1-(b)-(1) for continuing or establishing a National Collegiate Championship in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that teams in a sport in a division that has a national championship in that sport shall not be counted toward meeting the minimum sports sponsorship percentage necessary to continue or establish a National Collegiate Championship in that sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council and Executive Committee after being withdrawn from the consent package.

Academics

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 14, 15 and 16 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 14 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 92-93, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]"

Source: Alabama State University, Grambling State University, Jackson State University, Mississippi Valley State University, Prairie View A&M University, Texas Southern University and five other member institutions.

Intent: To eliminate the minimum SAT or ACT score requirement for initial eligibility at a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated by Division I (roll-call vote; 47-249, seven abstentions).

NO. 15 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 92-93, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT **and has taken the SAT or ACT for placement purposes only**. An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a

maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]"

Source: Alabama State University, Grambling State University, Jackson State University, Mississippi Valley State University, Prairie View A&M University, Texas Southern University and five other member institutions.

Intent: To utilize the SAT or ACT requirement in Bylaw 5-1-(j) for institutional placement purposes only and delete any reference to scores from those tests for purposes of determining initial eligibility at a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated by Division I (roll-call vote; 66-233, five abstentions).

NO. 16 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 92-93, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT,

or
"(ii) Presented more than the minimum standard set forth in the preceding paragraph for either the core-curriculum grade-point average or required test score, in which case eligibility may be established during the specified time periods on the basis of the following eligibility indices:

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1986, and prior to August 1, 1987:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.200-above	660	13
2.100-2.199	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16
1.800-1.899	740	17

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1987, and prior to August 1, 1988:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.100-above	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during

the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]"

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To include eligibility indices during the specified time periods for purposes of defining a "qualifier" per Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I (roll-call vote; 207-94, four abstentions).

NO. 17 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), pages 95-96, by adding new subparagraph (iv), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(iv) The student-athlete must have earned the following accumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) to be eligible for: (1) a first season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 1.700; (2) a second season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 1.850; (3) a third and fourth season of competition after the freshman year in any sport: 2.000."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish qualitative academic progress requirements for eligibility.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division I (134-178).

NO. 18 ACADEMIC REPORTING

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5, Section 6-(e)-(4), page 109, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(4) The institution's graduation rate for recruited student-athletes in each sport and the graduation rate for students generally for the entering freshman class that began attendance as full-time, regularly matriculated, degree-seeking students at the institution *five six* years prior to the regular fall term that includes the October 1 deadline established in paragraph(e). For purposes of this legislation, the 'graduation rate' shall be based upon the number of students who entered the member institution with no previous collegiate attendance and graduated within five academic years of the date of initial enrollment. Transfer students (from two-year or four-year colleges) shall be included in the graduation-rate calculations as a part of the class that had completed a number of terms equal to the number of terms of full-time collegiate attendance that the transfer student had completed prior to the transfer to the certifying institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit Division I member institutions to conduct their initial review

of five-year graduation rates under the academic-reporting proposal adopted at the 1985 special Convention on the basis of student enrollment initiated six, rather than five, years preceding the date the report is due.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following three proposals for placement at this point in the agenda.]

NO. 19 ELIGIBILITY OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

A. Constitution: Amend O.I. 11, following Constitution 4-2-(a), page 29, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 11. If a student-athlete is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association, the institution shall be obligated immediately to apply the applicable rule and withhold the student-athlete from all intercollegiate competition. Subsequent to this action, the member institution may appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee if the member concludes that the circumstances warrant restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility. Such appeal must be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative or director of athletics; and at least one of those individuals must participate in any hearing of the appeal that involves direct participation by the student-athlete or other individuals representing the institution or the student-athlete. A student-athlete is responsible for his or her involvement in a 'secondary' or 'major' violation of NCAA regulations [as defined in Section 2-(d) of the NCAA enforcement procedure] and the Eligibility Committee may restore the eligibility of a student involved in such a violation only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration. The eligibility of a student-athlete involved in a 'major' violation shall not be restored other than through an exception authorized by the Eligibility Committee in a unique case on the basis of specifically stated reasons."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(i), page 92, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) The student-athlete's enrollment or attendance shall not have been solicited by the certifying institution or any representative of its athletics interests in violation of the Association's legislation as acknowledged by the institution or established through the Association's enforcement procedures.

"(1) The certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility.

"(2) A student-athlete is responsible for his or her involvement in a 'secondary' or 'major' violation of NCAA regulations [as defined in Section 2-(d) of the NCAA enforcement procedure] during the student's recruitment and the Eligibility Committee may restore the

eligibility of a student involved in such a violation only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration. The eligibility of a student-athlete involved in a 'major' violation shall not be restored other than through an exception authorized by the Eligibility Committee in a unique case on the basis of specifically stated reasons."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To affirm that student-athletes are responsible for their involvement in violations of NCAA regulations and should be restored to eligibility only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration and to require the Eligibility Committee to report the basis for restoration of eligibility in cases involving "major" violations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 19—1. ELIGIBILITY OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

A. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 19-A, Constitution 4-2-(a)—O.I. 11, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 11. If a student-athlete is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association, the institution shall be obligated immediately to apply the applicable rule and withhold the student-athlete from all intercollegiate competition. Subsequent to this action, the member institution may appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee if a member concludes that the circumstances warrant restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility. Such appeal must be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative or director of athletics; and at least one of those individuals must participate in any hearing of the appeal that involves direct participation by the student-athlete or other individuals representing the institution or the student-athlete. A student-athlete is responsible for his or her involvement in a 'secondary' or 'major' violation of NCAA regulations [as defined in Section 2-(d) of the NCAA enforcement procedure] and the Eligibility Committee may restore the eligibility of a student involved in such a violation only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration. *The eligibility of a student-athlete involved in a 'major' violation shall not be restored other than through an exception authorized by the Eligibility Committee in a unique case on the basis of specifically stated reasons.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19-B, Bylaw 5-1-(i)-(2), page 11, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A student-athlete is responsible for his or her involvement in a 'secondary' or 'major' violation of NCAA regulations [as defined in Section 2-(d) of the NCAA enforcement procedure] during the student's recruitment and the Eligibility Committee may restore the eligibility of a student involved in such a violation only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration. *The eligibility of a student-athlete involved in a 'major' violation shall not be restored other than through an exception authorized*

by the Eligibility Committee in a unique case on the basis of specifically stated reasons."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 20 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(g) and (h), adding new paragraph (i), pages 82-83, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) Any game or games played in Hawaii, either against or under the sponsorship of a member institution located in Hawaii; in Alaska, either against or under the sponsorship of a member institution located in Alaska, or in Puerto Rico, either against or under the sponsorship of a member institution located in Puerto Rico, shall not be considered a 'contest' or 'contests' by a member institution located outside the area in question in computing the maximum number of contests set forth in this section **except as required per Bylaw 3-3-(i)**. A member institution located in Hawaii or Alaska shall be permitted an additional contest in the sport of football.

"(h) The one basketball game permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(h) and the basketball games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(i) shall not be considered a 'contest' in computing the maximum number of permissible basketball contests **except as required per Bylaw 3-3-(i)**.

"(i) Each academic year in the sport of basketball, a member institution shall exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests not more than one contest or tournament (not to exceed four contests) in not more than one of the situations set forth in Bylaws 3-3-(g) and (h) and shall not participate in a foreign tour in basketball in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any such exemption. This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(b), page 85, by adding new subparagraph (8) as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(8) In the sport of basketball, an institution shall not engage in a foreign tour that is prohibited by Bylaw 3-3-(i)."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To permit a member institution's intercollegiate basketball team to participate in any one year in not more than one of the opportunities for competition, including a foreign tour, that do not count toward the maximum number of contests.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 20—1.

NO. 20—1 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF CONTESTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 20-A, Bylaw 3-3-(i), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) Each academic year in the sport of basketball, a member institution shall exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests not more than one contest or tournament (not to exceed four contests) in not more than one of the situations set forth in Bylaws 3-3-(g) and (h), **excluding the contest against a foreign team in the United States**, and shall not participate in a foreign tour in basketball in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any such exemption. This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.
Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 20—2 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

A. **Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 20-A, Bylaw 3-3-(i), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) Each academic year in the sport of basketball, a member institution shall exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests not more than one contest or tournament (not to exceed four contests) in not more than one of the situations set forth in Bylaws 3-3-(g) and (h) **and shall not participate in a foreign tour in basketball in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any such exemption.** This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 20-B, Bylaw 3-6-(b)-(8), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(8) *In the sport of basketball, an institution shall not engage in a foreign tour that is prohibited by Bylaw 3-3-(i).*"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.
Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 21 RESOLUTION: ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, a minimum, required penalty structure was adopted by the membership in June 1985 related to 'secondary' and 'major' violations;

"Whereas, the effective and efficient administration of the enforcement program under the new penalty structure may require procedural changes that could represent departures from current policies; and

"Whereas, Proposal No. 3—3, a resolution concerning possible modifications in the enforcement procedures, was referred by the fifth special Convention to the NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission and those bodies have asked the Committee on Infractions to review and make recommendations in regard to the issues raised in that resolution prior to the Commission and Council finally considering them; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Executive Committee and Council have initiated a new compliance service as a part of the increased Association-wide effort to

achieve greater adherence to the governing legislation of intercollegiate athletics;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Committee on Infractions be encouraged to evaluate possible changes in enforcement policies and procedures over the next year that may appear necessary for the efficient and effective processing of 'secondary' and 'major' infractions cases and to assure continuing due-process protection for all involved; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the committee be encouraged to exercise its authority to modify Section 12 of the enforcement procedure as necessary on an experimental basis during that period in order to identify possible changes and to determine whether such changes would be desirable on a continuing basis, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that during the course of 1986, the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council will give further consideration to the operations of the NCAA enforcement effort, and the newly organized compliance project, and will determine whether to submit additional legislation to the 1987 Convention that would enhance these essential programs."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Action: Approved.

Financial Aid

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 22 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 22 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION

A. **Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The award of financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (*i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books*) as defined in Bylaw 6-1, or the cost of education for the institution, as defined by the U.S. Department of Education, whichever is less, other than legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students."

B. **Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d) and (e), pages 21-22, as follows, deleting all subparagraphs of paragraph (d) and deleting paragraph (e), relettering subsequent paragraphs:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) Where a student-athlete's ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding unearned financial aid, such aid shall not be awarded for a period in excess of one academic year, *and if such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources exceeds the amount defined in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and the bylaws, the student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics.*"

C. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 6, pages 111-117, by deleting Section 1, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Section 1. Division III Exemption. Division III members shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this article."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, pages 111-117, by adding new Section I, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Commonly Accepted Educational Expenses. (a) Commonly accepted educational expenses shall be limited to the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books.

(b) If a recruited student-athlete is receiving financial aid administered by the institution, the student shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources exceeds the amount defined in Bylaw 6-1-(a).

(1) Employment during semester or term time, which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing day of classes of the semester, quarter or term, except for the vacation periods properly listed on the institution's official calendar.

(i) An institution shall count income from any employment during semester or term time, regardless of whether the student-athlete's job is one obtained following completion of eligibility in the student-athlete's senior year; gifts given to a student-athlete following completion of eligibility in appreciation or recognition of the student-athlete's athletic accomplishments, and any bonus or salary from a professional sports organization, or any other income from participation in an athletics event, no matter when received or contracted for.

(ii) A student-athlete receiving aid under this section may, however, obtain a job within seven days prior to the beginning of the institution's Christmas vacation period, provided it is necessary to do so to secure the employment. The income so derived from the additional week's employment need not be computed in determining the maximum allowable financial aid.

(2) Governmental grants for educational purposes, except:

(i) Benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights;

(ii) Payment to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time);

(iii) Payments by the U.S. government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service- Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program; or

(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900.

(v) State government awards to disabled veterans, provided such awards are approved by the Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting.

(3) Other scholarships and grants-in-aid, except an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement may be received without its being included in the maximum allowable financial aid computation if it is a standing scholarship award published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the award is the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution and the award is determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution.

(c) In the event that a student-athlete's income from the sources listed in Bylaw 6-1-(b), when coupled with the value of the institution's scholarship or grant-in-aid, will exceed 'commonly accepted educational expenses' for the balance of the academic year, the institution shall reduce institutional aid so as not to exceed 'commonly accepted educational expenses' as of the date the student-athlete begins working on the job, is awarded the grant or receives the additional income. Payments credited to a student-athlete's account that are not refundable by the institution to the scholarship office or other appropriate institutional agency shall not become the student's obligation."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To remove from the constitution and place in the bylaws the current definition of commonly accepted educational expenses and the limitations on the total amount of financial aid in combination with funds from other sources that a student-athlete may receive, retaining a maximum limitation in the constitution. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to conform references to commonly accepted educational expenses in other provisions to this legislation.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council and Presidents Commission. Later motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 23 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(2)-(iv), page 22, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900."

Source: University of Bridgeport; Duquesne University; Florida State University; Keene State College; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Texas, Austin; all 10 members of the Big Ten Conference, and six other member institutions.

Intent: To exempt the full Pell Grant award from the limitation on the amount of financial aid that a student-athlete may receive under NCAA legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 24 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(2)-(iv), page 22, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900 **\$1,400**."

Source: Florida State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Pennsylvania State University; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and University of Wyoming.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant, as well as institutionally administered financial assistance, to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$1,400.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 25 FINANCIAL AID—UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 20, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Financial aid, including a grant-in-aid that carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance as an undergraduate *with eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1, or within six years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution (provided the student does not receive such aid for more than five years during that period)*, or as a graduate eligible under Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3), provided the student-athlete is not under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference, if any."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit an undergraduate student-athlete to receive financial aid beyond the period of eligibility set forth in Bylaw 4-1 (five-year rule).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated (405-217, two-thirds majority required).

NO. 26 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

A. Constitution: Add new O.I. 2, following Constitution 3-1, page 9, renumbering subsequent O.I.s, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 2. An enrolled student-athlete is one who (i) has been

unconditionally admitted in accordance with the regularly published entrance requirements of that institution, and either (ii) is officially registered and enrolled at the institution on the opening day of classes in any term (including the institution's summer term or summer school) in a minimum full-time academic load, or (iii) has attended a class or classes in any term (including the institution's summer term or summer school) in which the student was enrolled in a minimum full-time academic load."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 20, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may *not* be provided a student while attending a summer school or summer term *unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program. Such This* financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, except that the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this restriction for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 60-61, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance based on athletic ability during the summertime prior to the freshman year shall not be subject to the provisions of this section."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(l), page 99, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraph, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance based upon athletic ability during the summertime prior to the freshman year shall be subject to the transfer rule for an enrolled student-athlete."

Source: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, Michigan State University, Ohio State University, Purdue University and one other Big Ten Conference member institution.

Intent: To permit an incoming student-athlete to receive financial aid during the summertime prior to the student's freshman year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 26—1 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

C. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 26-C, bylaw 1-6-(c), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance

based on athletic ability during the summertime prior to the freshman year shall not be subject to the provisions subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; Ohio State University; Purdue University; and one other Big Ten Conference member institution.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 27 FINANCIAL AID—ESTABLISHED AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(a)-(4), page 19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program for the recognition of outstanding high school graduates on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletics participation may be a major criterion; disbursement of the assistance shall be through the member institution for the educational expenses of the recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected; the recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance; the awarding individual or organization and the donor of the assistance shall not be a representative of the athletics interests or an athletics booster group of a member institution; the value of the award shall not exceed the **Association's definition of commonly accepted educational expenses, sum of \$1,000 for an academic year, and the award is for only one academic year and is provided to the recipient on only one occasion, and provided that if the recipient is recruited, the award is considered 'financial aid' per O.I. 600, the recipient is considered a 'countable player' per Bylaw 6-3 and the amount is applied to the maximum awards limitations of Bylaw 6 for the sport in question."**

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an established financial aid award subject to the stipulated criteria, which would be modified to increase the permissible value of such an award and to permit its provision for an unlimited term.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 28 FINANCIAL AID—HONORARY AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(3), page 22, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Other scholarships and grants-in-aid, except an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement may be received without its being included in the maximum allowable financial aid computation if it is **provided by the recipient's high school, or if it is a standing scholarship award published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the award is the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution and the award is determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution. The awarding institution must be the collegiate**

institution in which the recipient is enrolled or the high school from which the recipient graduated, and when such an award is based upon the candidate's record in high school, it must be disbursed through the member collegiate institution."

Source: All nine members of the Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement in high school without its being included in the maximum allowable financial aid computation if the award is disbursed through a member institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated (386-208); two-thirds majority required).

NO. 29 FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCIES

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 600, following Bylaw 6-3-(e), page 111, as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"O.I. 600. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 6 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships; grants; loans; work-study program assistance; on-campus employment **for the department of athletics, physical education and recreation**, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient, and assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4-(a)-(4), as well as off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletics interests of the institution interceded in behalf of the recipient, except that honorary awards for outstanding academic achievement that are standing scholarship awards published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the awards being the candidate's academic records at the awarding institution and the awards being determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution, and legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students, shall not be considered accountable financial aid."

Source: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota and three other Big Ten Conference member institutions.

Intent: To permit athletes in the equivalency sports to work for departments of the university other than athletics, physical education and recreation, and not have compensation for this term-time employment counted toward the financial aid limits for those sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 29-1 FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCIES

C.Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 29, Bylaw 6-3-(e)—O.I. 600, as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"O.I. 600. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 6 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships; grants; loans; work-study program assistance; on-campus employment for the department of athletics, physical education and recreation, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient, and assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4(a)-(4), as well as on-campus and off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletics interests of the institution interceded in behalf of the recipient, except that honorary awards published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the awards being the candidate's academic records at the awarding institution and the awards being determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution, and legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students, shall not be considered accountable financial aid."

Source: University of Illinois; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, and three other Big Ten Conference member institutions.

Action: Defeated (283-328).

General

NO. 30 DRUG TESTING

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, pages 23-24, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution or others employed by the intercollegiate athletics program who have knowledge of the use contrary to Bylaw 5-2 by a student-athlete of a substance on the list of banned drugs set forth in Executive Regulation 1-7-(b), and who fail to follow institutional procedures dealing with drug abuse, shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Section 7-(b)-(12) of the NCAA enforcement procedure."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(i), page 28, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) The student-athlete shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under the governing legislation of this Association, and consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(f), page 68, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The eligibility rules governing individual participation and drug usage shall be as demanding as those governing participation in NCAA-sponsored meets and tournaments."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2, page 103, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 2. Drugs. (a) A student-athlete who is found to have utilized (in preparation for or participation in an NCAA championship or certified postseason football contest) a substance on the list of banned drugs set forth in Executive Regulation 1-7-(b) shall not be eligible for further participation in postseason competition. Subject to the ineligibility provisions of the following paragraph, the certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility if the institution concludes that circumstances warrant restoration.

"(b) A student-athlete who tests 'positive' in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee shall remain ineligible for postseason competition for a minimum of 90 days after the test date. If the student-athlete tests 'positive' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of one season of postseason eligibility in all sports and shall remain ineligible for postseason competition at least through the succeeding academic year.

"(c) The Executive Committee shall adopt a list of banned drugs, shall authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes who compete in NCAA championships and certified postseason football contests, and, in conjunction with the Council, may provide guidelines for drug testing of student-athletes by member institutions during the regular season. The list of banned drugs and the authorized methods for drug testing at NCAA championships shall be set forth in Executive Regulation 1-7."

E. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, pages 167-191, by adding new Section 7, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 7. Drugs. (a) The Executive Committee shall authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes who compete in NCAA championships and certified postseason football contests. The authorized methods, and any subsequent modifications, shall be published in The NCAA News and copies of the report shall be available, on request, to member institutions. The Executive Committee shall determine those championships and certified postseason football contests for which drug tests shall be made and the procedures to be followed in disclosing its determinations.

"(b) The following is the list of banned drugs:

"(1) Psychomotor stimulants:

amphetamine
benzphetamine
chlorphentermine

fencamfamin
meclofenozate
methylamphetamine

cocaine	methylphenidate	cocaine
diethylpropion	norpseudoephedrine	heroin
dimethylamphetamine	phendimetrazine	marijuana ³
pemoline	phentermine	
phenmetrazine	prolintane	
piradol	and related compounds	
ethylamphetamine		
(2) Sympathomimetic amines:		
chlorprenaline	methoxyphenamine	THC (tetrahydro-cannabinol)
ephedrine	methyldphedrine	others
etadreline	phenylpropanolamine	
isoetharine	and related compounds	
isoprenaline		
(3) Miscellaneous central nervous system stimulants:		
amiphenazole	ethamivan	
bemigride	leptazol	
caffeine ¹	nikethamide	
cropropamide	picrotoxine	
croletamide	strychnine	
doxapram	and related compounds	
(4) Anabolic steroids:		
clostebol	norethandrolene	
dehydrochlormethyl-testosterone	oxandrolone	
fluoxymesterone	oxymesterone	
mesterolone	oxymetholone	
methenolone	stanozolol	
methandienone	testosterone ²	
nandrolone	and related compounds	
(5) Substances banned for specific sports:		
Rifle:		
alcohol	pindolol	
atenolol	propranolol	
metoprolol	timolol	
nadolol	and related compounds	
(6) Diuretics:		
bendroflumethiazide	hydroflumethiazide	
benzthiazide	methylclothiazide	
bumetanide	metolazone	
chlorothiazide	polythiazide	
chlorthalidone	quinethazone	
cyclothiazide	spironolactone	
ethacrynic acid	triامeterene	
flumethiazide	trichlormethiazide	
flurosemide	and related compounds	
hydrochlorothiazide		
(7) Street drugs:		
amphetamine	methamphetamine	

“Definition of positive depends on the following:
¹for caffeine—if the concentration in urine exceeds 15 micrograms/ml.
²for testosterone—if the ratio of the total concentration of testosterone to that of epitestosterone in the urine exceeds 6.
³for marijuana—based on a repeat testing.

(c) Exceptions for categories (5) and (6) of paragraph (b) of Executive Regulation 1-7 may be made by the Executive Committee for those student-athletes with a documented medical history demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug.”

F. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 9-(a), page 183, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(a) The NCAA executive director first shall deduct game and administrative expenses, including 50 percent of the costs of drug-testing championship participants if authorized by the NCAA Executive Committee in accordance with Executive Regulation 1, Section 7, and costs incurred by governing sports committees and their representatives in matters of championship administration.”

G. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 10-(a), page 184, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(a) The NCAA executive director first shall deduct game and administrative expenses, including 50 percent of the costs of drug-testing championship participants if authorized by the NCAA Executive Committee in accordance with Executive Regulation 1, Section 7, and costs incurred by governing sports committees and their representatives in matters of championship administration.”

H. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 4, Section 3, page 193, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“Section 3. The gross receipts shall include all revenues derived from the game, including sale of tickets (less applicable taxes, except those paid as stadium-use taxes for stadium rental or in lieu thereof), concessions, programs, radio rights, television rights, movie rights and any other income derived from the operation of the game. Any complimentary tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of the gross receipts. Fifty percent of the costs of drug-testing game participants, if authorized by the NCAA Executive Committee in accordance with Executive Regulation 1, Section 7, shall be deducted from said gross receipts prior to their distribution.”

Source: NCAA Council (Special NCAA Committee on National Drug-Testing Policy).

Intent: To establish a list of banned drugs; to authorize the Executive Committee to establish a drug-testing program for NCAA championships and certified postseason football contests and, with the Council, provide recommended guidelines for regular-season drug testing by member institutions; to authorize penalties for institutional staff members who know of use by student-athletes of banned drugs and who fail to follow institutional procedures regarding drug abuse; to require student-athletes in conjunction with the annual signing of the student-athlete statement to consent to be tested for drug usage; to establish loss of postseason eligibility as a consequence of use of a banned drug by a student-athlete, and to stipulate the revisions of executive regulations necessary to finance the cost of this program. [Note: Estimated direct cost to Association: \$310,000 in 1986-87.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved all parts.

NO. 30—1 DRUG TESTING

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 30-D, Bylaw 5-2, adding new paragraph (d), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(d) The form prescribed by the NCAA Council for the self-study and evaluation required by Constitution 4-2-(b) shall include as a subject the institution's implementation of the drug education program recommended by the NCAA Drug Education Committee.”

Source: Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania and two other Ivy Group member institutions.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 31 RESOLUTION: GAMBLING

[All divisions, common vote]

“Whereas, the NCAA president, with the support of the Association's Council, earlier this year urged the President's Commission on Organized Crime to recommend to President Reagan the strengthening of Federal legislation dealing with gambling on intercollegiate athletics; and

“Whereas, the proposed improvements in Federal law include (a) amendment to the sports bribery statute (18 U.S.C. S 224) to cover intrastate as well as interstate activities, (b) amendment to the statute (18 U.S.C. S 1084) prohibiting interstate transmission of wagering information to include transmission of odds or point-spread information, and (c) as advocated by the President's Commission on Gambling in 1976, adoption of a statutory prohibition on gambling on amateur sports events;

“Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the membership of the National Collegiate Athletic Association formally request the President's Commission on Organized Crime to include in its final report to President Reagan recommendations for the implementation of all three of the above-cited statutory changes; and

“Be It Further Resolved, that this Association pledges its full support toward encouraging the Congress to adopt these statutory changes.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

NO. 32 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP—LITIGATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, page 31, by adding new paragraph (h), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(h) To abide by the following standards concerning litigation: If any legal proceeding against the Association (or any of its members) challenging any action or legislation of the Association is commenced by any other person, the member whose athletics issues are involved shall cooperate fully with the Association in defending such legal proceeding or, if a party, shall duly defend such legal proceeding; provided that such cooperation shall include appropriate notification to the Association of the litigation, consultation and cooperation with the Association and its legal counsel during the case, and support for a motion to remove a case from state court to Federal court.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a member to cooperate in the defense of lawsuits brought by others against the Association and its member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn

NO. 33 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP—INTERNAL REMEDIES

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, page 31, by adding new paragraph (h), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(h) To abide by the following standards concerning litigation:

“(1) No member shall commence any legal proceeding against the Association (or any of its members) challenging any action or legislation of the Association until all procedures of the Association for appeal and review of the disputed action or legislation shall have been exhausted. Such procedures shall not require an appeal to or review by the members at an annual Convention.

“(2) No member shall encourage or induce, directly or indirectly, any other person to commence such legal proceedings as described above until all of the applicable procedures of the Association for appeal and review of the disputed action or legislation have been exhausted by such member.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a member to pursue internal appeal and review procedures of the Association before becoming involved, directly or indirectly, in legal actions designed to exempt the member institution from legislation adopted by the Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 34 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP—LEGAL COSTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 5, page 126, by adding new paragraph (f), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

(f) Any member institution whose staff member or student-athlete commences a legal proceeding against the Association without having exhausted the internal procedures of the Association for appeal and review, or any member institution that fails to meet its membership obligations to cooperate with the Association in defending such a legal proceeding (initiated by the member's student-athlete or staff member), may be charged by action of the Council (or its subcommittee), following final and unappealable termination of the legal proceeding, for 50 percent of the Association's expenses, including legal fees, incurred by the Association in defending such legal proceeding, provided the final judgment in such proceeding does not determine the disputed action or legislation to be unlawful."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Council or a subcommittee of the Council to hold a member accountable for 50 percent of the legal costs incurred by the Association in defending under the specified conditions a suit initiated by the member institution's staff member or student-athlete against the Association if the suit is denied by the courts.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 35 RESTITUTION PROCEDURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 10, page 214, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 10. If a student-athlete who is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association is permitted to participate in intercollegiate competition contrary to such NCAA legislation but in accordance with the terms of a court restraining order or injunction operative against the institution attended by such student-athlete or the Association, or both, and said injunction is subsequently voluntarily vacated, stayed, reversed, **declared to be moot, rendered unenforceable**, or finally determined by the courts that injunctive relief is not or was not justified, the Council may take any one or more of the following actions against such institution in the interest of restitution and fairness to competing institutions:"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that the restitution provisions of Section 10 of the enforcement procedure may be applied if the lawsuit in question is declared to be moot or if a restraining order or injunction otherwise ceases to be enforceable.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 36 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS—COST ESTIMATES

A. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(b), page 49, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) The sponsors of each proposed resolution that, if adopted, would **result in require** significant expenditures from the Association's budget **and/or for member institutions** shall provide, prior to the deadline set forth in this section, written documentation of the estimated costs to the Association **and/or the members**. The information shall be included with the copy of the proposed resolution distributed to the membership."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(d), page 51, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) The sponsors of each proposed amendment that, if adopted, would **result in require** significant expenditures from the Association's budget **and/or for member institutions** shall provide, in accordance with the deadline provisions of Constitution 7-1-(a), written documentation of the estimated costs to the Association **and/or the members**. The information shall be included with the copy of the proposed amendment mailed to all members in accordance with Constitution 7-2."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(d), page 162, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) The sponsors of each proposed amendment that, if adopted, would **result in require** significant expenditures from the Association's budget **and/or for member institutions** shall provide, in accordance with the deadline provisions of Bylaw 13-1-(a), written documentation of the estimated costs to the Association **and/or the members**. The information shall be included with the copy of the proposed amendment mailed to all members in accordance with Bylaw 13-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require the sponsors of proposed legislation that, if adopted, would require significant expenditures for member institutions to provide written documentation of the estimated costs to member institutions for inclusion in the Official Notice of the Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved all parts.

NO. 37 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S INDOOR TRACK CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 105, by deleting the following:

[Division I only]

*"National Collegiate Division I Men's Indoor Track Championships
"National Collegiate Division I Women's Indoor Track Championships"*

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, pages 106-107, by deleting the

following:

[Division III only]

"National Collegiate Division III Men's Indoor Track Championships
"National Collegiate Division III Women's Indoor Track Championships"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the Division I and Division III Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986; the 1986-87 academic year to be the first year in which the championships would not be held.

Action: Defeated by Division I; defeated by Division III (85-105).

NO. 38 CRITERIA FOR CONDUCT OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(f), page 168, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(f) If any championship falls below the required minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a)-(1) and (2) and Executive Regulations 1-1-(b)-(1) and (2) for two consecutive years, the championship automatically shall be discontinued, except that the **Divisions II and III Championships Committees may determine to continue an existing championship in their respective divisions during the 1986-87 academic year, and a championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses (including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in Executive Regulation 1-11) shall be exempt from this provision.**" [Remainder of paragraph unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions II and III Steering Committees).

Intent: To permit the championships committees responsible for administering the 1986-87 block-grant funding program to continue an existing Division II or III championship under the specified circumstances.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 39 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(i), page 69, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) Radio broadcasts and telecasts of such games shall conform to the same sponsorship restrictions that govern the broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championships (Executive Regulation 1-17). During the telecast of a certified game, the promotion of other television programming shall conform to the same restrictions as those governing telecasts of NCAA championships [Executive Regulation 1-16-(f)]. During radio broadcasts and telecasts of such games, a minimum of 150 120 seconds shall be reserved during which promotional messages for the participating institutions, higher education in general or both shall be presented."

Source: NCAA Council (Postseason Football Committee).

Intent: To reduce from 150 seconds to 120 the minimum amount of time on certified postseason football contest broadcasts or telecasts for promotional messages for the participating institutions and higher education.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

Recruiting

NO. 40 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(b), page 56, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) All contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian *off campus* for purposes of recruitment shall be made by institutional staff members. Such in-person, *off-campus* contact by representatives of an institution's athletics interests is prohibited."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To prevent any recruiting contact by representatives of athletics interests on campus or off campus, limiting involvement in recruiting to institutional staff members.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council by Divisions I and II.

NO. 41 RECRUITING—EVALUATION VISITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, page 58, by adding new paragraph (d), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(d) Institutional staff members of any one member institution who are participating in off-campus scouting activities for the purpose of evaluating the playing ability of team sports prospects shall be prohibited from attending more than a total of six regular-season contests of any one educational institution attended by any prospect in any academic year, and such scouting activities shall not involve contact with the prospect or his or her parents or guardians."

Source: University of Bridgeport, Central Michigan University, Duquesne University, University of Florida, University of Iowa, University of Northern Iowa and one other member institution.

Intent: To limit noncontact off-campus talent assessment to six regular-season observations of a prospect's team (excluding attendance at postseason events in which the team may participate) per NCAA member institution.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Referred to NCAA Recruiting Committee.

NO. 42 LETTER OF INTENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(iii), page 55, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iii) No member institution may participate in an institutional or a conference athletics letter-of-intent program **or issue an institutional or a conference financial aid agreement** that involves a signing date in *the sport of football or basketball any sport* that precedes the initial signing date for that sport in the National Letter of Intent program."

Source: NCAA Council (all nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference).

Intent: To prohibit the issuance of institutional or conference financial aid agreements prior to the initial signing date stipulated for the sport in the National Letter of Intent program and to apply the legislation to all sports rather than just football and basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 43 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1), page 54, by rewording subparagraph (i), inserting new subparagraph (ii) and relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"(i) In sports other than football, *Three* additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative.

"(ii) In football only, campus contact per prospect shall be permitted during each week of the appropriate contact period by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative; however, a member institution may visit a prospect's educational institution for this purpose on no more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of recruited prospects enrolled in the same institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit each Division I-A or I-AA member institution to visit a football prospect's educational institution only once each week for recruiting contact purposes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA as amended by No. 43—1. Division I-AA originally defeated No. 43 (27-46) and No. 43—1; later approved both after successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 43—1 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 43, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(1)-(ii), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote.]

"(ii) In football only, one additional in-person, off-campus contact per prospect shall be permitted during each week of the appropriate contact period by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative; however, a member institution may visit a prospect's educational institution *for this purpose* on no more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of recruited prospects enrolled in the same institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 44 RECRUITING CONTACTS AND VISITATIONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), page 56, by adding new subparagraph (7), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(7) A 2.000 nonqualifier enrolled during the first year of junior college may not be contacted in-person for recruiting purposes by a Division I member institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(a), page 62, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) A member institution may finance one and only one visit to its campus for a given prospective student-athlete. Such visit shall not exceed 48 hours. Only actual round-trip transportation costs by direct route between the student's home and the institution's campus may be paid. If commercial air transportation is used, the fare may not exceed tourist (or comparable) class. A 2.000 nonqualifier enrolled during the first year of junior college may not be provided such a visit by a Division I member institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit Division I members from providing official visits for and making in-person recruiting contacts with a 2.000 nonqualifier in the first year of junior college enrollment.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 45 RESOLUTION: RECRUITING CONTACT LIMITS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the recruitment of prospective student-athletes requires significant expenditures on the part of NCAA member institutions for travel, hotel and meal expenses of coaches; and

"Whereas, coaches engaged in the recruiting process spend inordinate amounts of time off campus and away from their primary duties as teachers and role models for enrolled student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the coach is a primary authority figure who is able to affect

positively and significantly the academic performance of enrolled student-athletes; and

"Whereas, excessive off-campus contact with prospective student-athletes creates tremendous pressure on these prospects and an unrealistic view of their self-importance; and

"Whereas, excessive off-campus contact with prospective student-athletes limits the time such prospects can spend on their high school academic responsibilities, including preparation for SAT and ACT tests and meeting the grade-point-average requirements for collegiate athletics eligibility;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that a committee be appointed to develop proposals for the establishment of limited recruiting contact periods for all NCAA championship sports, with the proposals to be considered at the 1987 NCAA Convention; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the committee solicit the advice of NCAA sports committees in developing such legislation."

Source: Central Michigan University, University of Iowa, Keene State College, Mary Baldwin College, Montana State University, New Mexico State University and five other member institutions.

[Note: Estimated cost to Association: \$800 x number on committee x number of meetings.]

Action: Referred to NCAA Recruiting Committee.

NO. 46 TRYOUT RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 60-61, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 6. Tryouts. (a) No member institution, on its campus or elsewhere, shall conduct or have conducted in its behalf any athletics practice session, tryout or test at which one or more prospective student-athletes reveal, demonstrate or display their abilities in any phase of any sport.

"(b) For the purposes of the tryout rule only, The phrase 'prospective student-athletes' shall include any *prospect* individual who has started classes for the ninth grade or has had his or her 15th birthday, whichever comes first, and is not registered enrolled in the institution at the time of the practice or test therein described, except that during preseason practice in fall sports or during practice occurring in midyear between terms on the academic calendar, it shall be permissible for a student-athlete who is not registered enrolled, but who has been accepted for admission to the institution, to engage in such activity, provided said practice is not used to determine whether aid is to be awarded.

"(c) The following situations shall not be considered tryouts under this legislation:

"(1) Developmental clinics or competition involving prospective student-athletes designed to develop fundamental skills in a sport (rather than to refine the abilities of skilled participants in the sport) and open to the general public (except for restrictions in age or number of participants), provided such activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, and provided the activity is conducted by and subject to the

control of the host NCAA member institution and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting;

"(2) Participation by a prospective student-athlete in 'open' events conducted by or held on the campus of a member institution, provided the competition is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting. Competition shall be considered 'open' if the selection of participants is not limited except by number, by geographical area or on the basis of some objective standard of performance;

"(2)(3) Regularly scheduled high school athletics contests or matches conducted by a member institution or sponsored jointly with an outside organization, held on the campus of a member institution, provided the competition is opportunity to participate in the event is not limited to specific prospective student-athletes or high schools and all individual prospects or high schools in a specific geographical area are eligible to compete (limited only by number, high school classification or on the basis of some objective standard of performance), provided the event appears on the high schools' schedules and has been approved prior to the sports season by the appropriate state high school authority or is conducted by a national sports federation of which this Association is a member, and provided no awards are presented to the participants;

"(3)(4) The regular or emergency use of a college member institution's facilities by a high school athletics team for its normal practice activities conducted solely by the high school coaches or for regularly scheduled high school contests conducted solely by the participating high schools, provided the competition is approved by the appropriate state high school authority and provided the institution and represenathletics interests are not involved in any way in the invitation or selection of participating schools or individuals;

"(4)(5) The use of an a member institution's facilities for physical activities by a group involving prospective student-athletes, provided the institution's athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in the conduct, supervision, promotion or administration of the activity and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting;

"(5)(6) The participation of an institution's athletics department staff member in recognized regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided such participation is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting."

[Paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the application of the tryout rule to those individuals who have begun classes for the ninth grade or have attained their 15th birthday, to clarify the exceptions to the tryout rule and to provide a definition of "open" competition involving prospects that can be approved by the NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 47 SPORTS CAMPS, COACHING SCHOOLS AND CLINICS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, pages 53-67, by adding new Section 7, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 7. Sports Camps, Coaching Schools and Clinics. (a) Any sports camp, coaching school or instructional clinic that (1) is operated by a member institution either on or off its campus or (2) involves one or more of the institution's athletics department personnel on a full- or part-time basis or (3) utilizes the institution's facilities, is considered to be the institution's camp, clinic or school.

"(b) A member institution's sports camp, coaching school or clinic shall be open to any and all entrants (limited only by number and age) except that a senior prospective student-athlete shall not be permitted to enroll, participate or be employed at such a sports camp, clinic or coaching school. For the purposes of this legislation, a 'senior prospective student-athlete' is one who is eligible for admission to a member institution or who has started classes for the senior year in high school.

"(c) A member institution's sports camp, coaching school or clinic shall involve activities designed to improve overall skills and general knowledge in the sport.

"(d) In operating a specialized sports camp, coaching school or clinic, a member institution, member of its staff or representative of its athletics interests shall not employ or give free or reduced admission privileges to a high school or junior college athletics award winner.

"O.I. 103. A specialized sports camp shall be one that places special emphasis on a particular sport or sports and provides specialized instruction, practice and usually competition.

"O.I. 104. A diversified sports camp shall be one that offers a balanced camping experience, including participation in seasonal summer sports and recreational activities, without emphasis on instruction, practice or competition in any particular sport.

"(e) No intercollegiate football or men's basketball squad member with eligibility remaining at a particular member institution may be employed or otherwise participate in that institution's camp specializing in the student- athlete's sport.

"(f) A member institution (or its athletics personnel) may employ a student-athlete as a counselor in a diversified summer camp, except not more than one member (with eligibility remaining) of the previous year's intercollegiate football squad and not more than one member (with eligibility remaining) of the previous year's intercollegiate men's basketball squad may be so employed.

"(g) A member institution (or its athletics personnel) may employ another institution's intercollegiate football or men's basketball squad member in its summer camp specializing in the student-athlete's sport, provided the student-athlete's duties are of a general supervisory character and any coaching or officiating assignments represent not more than one-

half of the student-athlete's work time, and provided not more than one (football or men's basketball) student-athlete of any one institution is employed. Further, the compensation shall be commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors of like teaching ability and summer-camp experience and may not be paid on the basis of the value that the student-athlete may have for the employee because of the athletics reputation or fame the student-athlete has achieved.

"(h) No member of the basketball coaching staff of a member institution may be employed by or lecture at a basketball camp established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To incorporate the current requirements of Bylaws 1-6-(e) and 1-10 and Case No. 419 concerning camps and clinics into a new Bylaw 1-7. [Note: Current Bylaws 1-6-(e) and 1-10 and appropriate portions of Case No. 419 will be deleted upon adoption of this proposal.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 48. PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b), page 54, by adding new paragraph (4), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) Institutions are permitted to provide the following materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide per sport;

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure per sport;

"(iv) One annual schedule poster per sport;

"(v) Game programs;

"(vi) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport;

"(vii) Student-athlete policy manuals, team rules or other department publications solely produced for and distributed to all student-athletes excluding newsletters or other publications regularly distributed to the public on a cost-free or subscription basis."

Source: University of Bridgeport, University of Iowa, Mary Baldwin College, St. Cloud State University, Southeast Missouri State University, Western Illinois University and four other member institutions.

Intent: To specify in the bylaws those printed materials that may be distributed to prospective student-athletes by the athletics departments of member institutions.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Approved in part by all divisions after successful motion to divide. Subparagraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi) approved by all divisions;

subparagraphs (iv) and (vii) defeated by all divisions (89-91 in Division III).

NO. 49 TRANSPORTATION TO CAMPUS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(g), page 64, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) An institution or its representatives shall not furnish a prospective student-athlete, directly or indirectly, with transportation to the campus for enrollment, except that a member of the institution's staff may provide transportation for the prospective student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or airport nearest the campus on the occasion of the student-athlete's initial arrival to attend classes."

Source: Duquesne University, University of Idaho, University of Montana, New Mexico State University, Utah State University, Weber State College and four other member institutions.

Intent: To permit an institution to transport a new student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or airport nearest the campus only at the time of the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 49—1.

NO. 49—1 TRANSPORTATION TO CAMPUS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 49, Bylaw 1-8-(g), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) An institution or its representatives shall not furnish a prospective student-athlete, directly or indirectly, with transportation to the campus for enrollment, except that a member of the institution's staff may provide transportation for the prospective student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or **major** airport nearest the campus on the occasion of the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes."

Source: All eight members of the High Country Athletic Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 50 SELF-FINANCED VISITS—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(f), page 64, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event for the exclusive use of the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit and transportation, when accompanied by an institutional staff member, only to view off-campus practice and competition sites within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus. In addition, a Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student

dining facilities during such a visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: University of Bridgeport; University of Iowa; Mary Baldwin College; University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Northern Illinois University; University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, and all eight members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Intent: To permit an institutional staff member to accompany a prospect who is on a self-financed visit and provide transportation for the purpose of viewing practice and/or competitive facilities that are located off the institution's main campus but within the 30-mile area surrounding the campus.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions. Later motion to reconsider in Division I defeated.

NO. 51 RECRUITING—TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, page 61, by adding new paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) No member of an institution's coaching staff may participate in coaching activities involving summer AAU basketball teams, regardless of the age of the participating prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit all individuals on coaching staffs of member institutions from participating in coaching activities involving summer AAU basketball teams.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 52 RECRUITING—COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 8-(f), page 64, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event in which the institution's intercollegiate team competes for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. In addition, a Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that an institution's intercollegiate team must compete in a campus athletics event in order for the institution to provide complimentary admissions to a prospect visiting the institution's campus at his or her own expense.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 53 RECRUITING—PUBLICITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4-(c), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A member institution shall not permit a prospective student-athlete or a high school, college preparatory school or junior college coach to appear on a radio or television program conducted by the member institution's coach, a program in which the NCAA institution's coach is participating, or a program for which a member of the athletics staff of the NCAA institution has been instrumental in arranging the appearance of the prospect or coach or related program material. This prohibition applies to appearances in person or via film or videotape. **This legislation does not prohibit a member of the athletics staff of an NCAA member institution from being interviewed as a pregame, half-time or postgame guest during the broadcast of a high school or junior college contest.**"

Source: Boise State University; University of Idaho; University of Montana; University of Nevada, Reno; Northern Arizona University, and Weber State College.

Intent: To allow an NCAA institution's staff member to be interviewed as a pregame, half-time or postgame guest during the broadcast of a high school or junior college contest.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 54 MEN'S ICE HOCKEY RECRUITING

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 56, by adding new subparagraph (v), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraphs (i) through (iv) unchanged.]

"(v) In the sport of men's ice hockey, during the period beginning with Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship game and ending at noon on the Sunday after the game."

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association and all 11 members of the Central Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To prohibit any in-person, on- or off-campus recruiting in the sport of

ice hockey by a member of a Division I coaching staff during the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Membership and Classification

NO. 55 FOUR-SPORT SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(g), page 31, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the four-sport sponsorship requirement for men or women if the institution provides data to demonstrate that the male-female enrollment ratio prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for one or the other. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To give the Council the authority to grant waivers of the four-sport sponsorship requirement for membership in the Association under the prescribed circumstances.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 56 TRACK AND FIELD

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b), pages 142-143, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least the following minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year:

	Division I	Division II
Indoor Track	6	5
Outdoor Track	6	5

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) The institution's team, in individual sports, shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest for it to be counted. The following minimums are applicable:

Indoor Track	14
Outdoor Track	14

[Subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) unchanged.]

"(6) A Division I institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor track and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 12 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least four indoor meets and at least four outdoor meets included in the total of 12. A Division II institution may receive credit in the same manner if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10."

[Subparagraph (7) renumbered and unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the opportunity to count indoor and outdoor track and field as separate sports for purposes meeting the sports sponsorship requirements for Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988; the 1987-88 academic year to be the final year in which indoor and outdoor track and field would be counted as separate sports.

Action: Approved by Division II; defeated by Division I.

NO. 57 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 134, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, **including at least two team sports**, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, **including at least two team sports**, involving all-female teams, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require Division I member institutions to sponsor at least two team sports for men and at least two for women. [Note: Team sports are identified in Bylaw 11-4-(b)-(3).]

Effective Date: September 1, 1986; Division I institutions would be required to sponsor at least two team sports for men and at least two for women during the 1986-87 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 58 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1, pages 134-138, by adding new paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) An institution desiring to remain a member of Division I may schedule and play not more than four women's basketball games against institutions that are not members of Division I. An institution applying

for membership in Division I may schedule and play not more than two women's basketball games against institutions that are not members of Division I."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Women's Basketball Committee).

Intent: To require women's basketball teams in Division I to meet the same scheduling requirements currently in place for Division I men's basketball teams.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987; Division I institutions would be required to meet the scheduling criterion during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 59 DIVISION I-A CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 135, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(1) The institution shall sponsor a minimum of **eight six** varsity intercollegiate sports, including football, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports in Division I involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1986, **seven such sports effective September 1, 1987, and eight such sports effective September 1, 1988**, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 and subject to the exception provisions of paragraph (c) of Section 1 of this article."

Source: Baylor University, East Carolina University, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, Texas Christian University, Vanderbilt University and one other member institution.

Intent: To reduce from eight to six the sports sponsorship criteria for men and women for membership in Division I-A.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A (53-59). Later motion to reconsider defeated (54-55).

NO. 60 DIVISION I-A CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 135, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(1) The institution shall sponsor a minimum of **eight seven** varsity intercollegiate sports, including football, involving all-male teams or mixed team of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports in Division I involving all-female teams effective September 1, 1986, **and seven such sports effective September 1, 1987, and eight such sports effective September 1, 1988**, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 and subject to the exception provisions of paragraph (c) of Section 1 of this article."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To reduce from eight to seven the sports sponsorship criteria for men and women for membership in Division I-A.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I-A (63-51).

NO. 61 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 138, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, in Division II, **with the exception that one of the two team sports utilized to meet this requirement may be sponsored in Division I. The sponsorship of such sports shall be with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit one of the two team sports specified in the Division II membership criteria to be classified in Division I. [Note: Appropriate editorial changes will be included in the previously revised portion of Bylaw 11-2-(b) that becomes effective September 1, 1987.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 62 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3, pages 139-142, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division III. An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams in Division III, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 4-2-(g)-(2)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require Division III member institutions to sponsor at least two team sports for men and at least two for women. [Note: Team sports are identified in Bylaw 11-4-(b)-(3).]

Effective Date: September 1, 1987; Division III institutions would be required to sponsor at least two team sports for men and at least two for women during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 63 DIVISION III CRITERIA

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3, pages 139-142, by adding new

paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division III, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams in Division III, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 4-2-(g)-(2)."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, pages 134-142, by adding new Section 4, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Section 4. Sports Sponsorship Criteria. (a) The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria in Section 3 of this article shall be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship meet or tournament, shall be recognized by the institution as varsity intercollegiate sports, and shall involve all-male teams, mixed teams of males and females or all-female teams.

"(b) In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least the following minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year:

Sport	Division III Sport	Division III
Baseball	12	Skiing 5
Basketball	18	Soccer 8
Cross Country	5	Softball 12
Fencing	6	Swimming 6
Field Hockey	8	Tennis 7
Football	8	Indoor Track 5
Golf	7	Outdoor Track 5
Gymnastics	6	Volleyball 8
Ice Hockey	12	Water Polo 12
Lacrosse	8	Wrestling 7
Rifle	8	

"(1) The institution's team actually shall participate in and complete each contest to be counted. Scheduled contests that are canceled or not completed in accordance with the playing rules of the sport in question may not be counted.

"(2) The institution's team, in individual sports, shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest for it to be counted. The following minimums are applicable:

Cross Country	5	Women's Fencing	3
Men's Fencing	5	Golf	5
Men's Gymnastics	6	Tennis	5
Women's Gymnastics	5	Indoor Track	10

Rifle	4	Outdoor Track	12
Skiing	5	Wrestling	6
Swimming	8		

(3) In the team sports (i.e., baseball, basketball, field hockey, football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, volleyball and water polo), each game in a doubleheader, tripleheader or tournament shall be counted as one contest. In the individual sports as listed in (2) above, each institution-vs.-institution meeting shall be counted in any multiteam competition (e.g., quadrangular track meet). If the institution achieves a single score in competition with the other competing institutions (e.g., a conference championship), it shall be counted as one contest.

(4) If an institution sponsors the same sport in two different seasons of the same academic year, it may count contests in both seasons if regular varsity competition is sponsored in both seasons and is so listed on the institution's official schedule in that sport.

(5) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution (i.e., weather conditions or disaster preventing completion of a scheduled competition, or verified injury or illness at the site of competition preventing the participation of the required minimum number of individuals).

(6) A Division III institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To establish minimum numbers of contests and minimum numbers of participants per contest in all sports in order to count those sports toward meeting the proposed minimum sports sponsorship criteria for men's and women's programs in Division III.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987; Division III institutions would be required to comply with the minimums during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter.

Action: Approved by Division III (Part A moot due to adoption of No. 62).

NO. 64 CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 4-(c), page 132, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An institution shall not be eligible for NCAA championships in the new division until three years after the September 1 on which its membership change becomes effective. To be eligible for NCAA championships in the new division on the effective September 1 three years after the membership change, the institution shall comply with all provisions of Executive Regulation 1-5-(b) and otherwise be eligible for participation in

those championships. In addition, a member that has been approved for transfer of membership to Division I shall comply with the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(c)."'

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a three-year waiting period from the time an institution's change of membership division becomes effective before the institution is eligible to compete in NCAA championships in the new division.

Effective Date: Immediately; the new requirement would apply to institutions that change membership division effective after the adoption of this proposal.

Action: Defeated. Approved by Divisions I and III, defeated by Division II; approval of all divisions required.

NO. 64-1 CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 64, Bylaw 10-4-(c), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

Effective Date: *Immediately September 15, 1986;* the new requirement would apply to institutions that change membership division effective after the adoption of this proposal *September 15, 1986.*

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 65 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(c), page 133, by adding new subparagraph (3), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) An active member institution that holds membership in one division and is eligible for a championship in another division in those sports for which there is no championship in its membership division shall apply the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in the sport involved as limited by the division in which it declares its intention to compete."

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, California University of Pennsylvania, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Millersville University of Pennsylvania, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania and one other member of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that a team competing in a championship in a division other than its membership division shall observe the limitations on number of contests or dates of competition in that sport of the division it has elected for championship competition. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to amend references to multidivision championship competition in other paragraphs.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 66 MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b), page 135, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) A member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division I-A, Division I-AA, Division II or Division III in football, and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in football. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in the division in which it is classified in football on legislative issues directly affecting football. A member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in any sport in which there is a Division III national championship but no Division II national championship."

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a Division II member to petition to be classified in Division III in a sport if there is a Division III championship in that sport but no Division II championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 67 MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b)-(1), page 131, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship. A member of Division I or Division II that has had its football program reclassified in Division III shall become eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship following its fourth consecutive season of Division III classification. A member of Division I or Division II that institutes football in the Division III classification shall become eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship following its first season of Division III classification. A member of Division I or Division II that reinstates football in the Division III classification and that has competed in intercollegiate athletics varsity football within the past one to three years shall become eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship following its third consecutive season of Division III classification."

Source: Hampden-Sydney College, Maryville College, Randolph- Macon College, Samford University, University of the South, and Washington and Lee University.

Intent: To permit Division I and Division II institutions that have instituted, reinstated or reclassified their football programs in Division III to compete for the Division III Football Championship after the specified periods of time. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made in other

related provisions.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. Approved by Divisions I and II, defeated by Division III (73-104); approval of all divisions required.

Eligibility

NO. 68 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d), pages 89-90, and delete subparagraph (2) in its entirety, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) The student-athlete shall not have engaged previously in more than four ~~five~~ seasons of intercollegiate competition.

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the institution for reasons of 'hardship,' which is defined as that incapacity resulting from injury or illness under the following conditions:

"(i) It occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution for members of Division II or III.

"(ii) It occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or has not participated in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greater, provided the injury or illness occurred in the first half of the season and resulted in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the season. Any contest (including a scrimmage) with outside competition is countable under the limitation. [Note: In applying the 20-percent limitation, any computation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be considered as six games.]

"(iii) This provision shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Boise State University; University of Idaho; University of Montana; University of Nevada, Reno; Northern Arizona University, and Weber State College.

Intent: To allow student-athletes five, rather than four, years of eligibility within the five-year period stipulated by the provisions of Bylaw 4-1 (five-year rule).

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council and Presidents Commission.

NO. 68—1 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 68, Bylaw 5-1-(d), as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Source: Boise State University.

Action: Approved.

NO. 69 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(1), page 90, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(1) Any participation during a season in an intercollegiate sport, regardless of time, shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. Cross country, *indoor track and field*, and *outdoor track and field* shall be considered separate sports.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that indoor and outdoor track are not treated as separate sports for purposes of determining the number of seasons of competition in which a student-athlete has competed.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division II only. Defeated by Division I and by Division III (91-96).

NO. 70 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 100-102, by deleting subparagraph (14), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(14) If the student-athlete transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and the following conditions are met:

“(i) The student has not transferred previously from one four-year college to another four-year college;

“(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance or the student’s athletically related financial assistance was not renewed;

“(iii) The student is in good academic standing and meets the satisfactory-progress requirements;

“(iv) The student’s previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement, and

“(v) The student is a participant in a sport other than football or men’s basketball.

“(vi) If the student transfers to the certifying institution from a Division III member institution and meets the above conditions, he or she may be eligible to compete but shall not receive institutionally administered financial aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate the one-time exception to the normal transfer residence requirements for a student-athlete transferring under the circumstances described in the legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 71 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(14)-(ii), page 102, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance or the student’s athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year at the previous institution;”

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the transfer requirement exception for a transferring student-athlete whose athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 71—1.

NO. 71—1 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 71, Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14)-(ii), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance at the previous institution, or the previous institution verifies in writing that the student’s athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year at the previous institution for reasons which were unrelated to the student’s transfer or which were beyond the control of the student;”

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 72 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(14)-(v), page 102, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(v) The student is a participant in a sport other than football or men’s or women’s basketball.”

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To specify that the Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) transfer exception is not available to women’s basketball players.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 73 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(14)-(v), page 102, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(v) The student is a participant in a sport other than football, or men's basketball or ice hockey."

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association and all 11 members of the Central Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To specify that the Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) transfer exception is not available to ice hockey players.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 74 TRANSFER RULE—RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(7), page 96, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(7) A transfer student from a four-year institution shall not be eligible for any NCAA championship until the student has fulfilled a residence requirement of one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters), and one full calendar year has elapsed from the first regular registration and attendance date at the certifying Division I or Division II institution. **Further, a transfer student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not utilize that semester or quarter for the purpose of establishing residency under either the academic-year or calendar-year requirement.** At a Division III institution, eligibility is not permitted for one calendar year from the student's official withdrawal date from the previous institution."

Source: All seven members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To prohibit the use of a specific term toward fulfilling the residency requirement for a transfer student admitted to a Division I or II member institution after the 12th class day of that semester or quarter.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved Divisions I and II.

NO. 75 JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(n), pages 102-103, by adding new subparagraph (3), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

- "(i) The student was not recruited per O.I. 100,
- "(ii) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete,
- "(iii) The student-athlete has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer and
- "(iv) The student-athlete was a 2.000 qualifier (if transferring to a Division I member institution) at the time of graduation from high school and was eligible for admission to the certifying institution prior to initial enrollment in the junior college."

Source: All seven members of the Northern California Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit an exception to the transfer residence requirement for a transferring junior college student under the conditions set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III only; defeated by Division I.

NO. 76 ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b)-(2), pages 18-19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) A student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in practice sessions provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within *five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To restrict the practice eligibility of a student who has received a baccalaureate degree to the time period set forth in Bylaw 4-1 (five-year rule) rather than limiting the period to five years from the student's initial enrollment in a collegiate institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 77 FIVE-YEAR RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(b), page 88, by adding new subparagraph (3), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(3) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by the Council to act for it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve such additional exceptions as it deems appropriate."

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions II and III Steering Committees).

Intent: To authorize the Council to grant additional extensions of the five-year period of eligibility for student-athletes at Divisions II and III institutions.

[Note: Editorial changes will be made in Case No. 273 to specify that it is applicable to student-athletes at Divisions II and III institutions as well.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 78 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3), pages 90-91, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. **Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted.**"

Source: Brigham Young University, University of Hawaii, University of New Mexico, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Military Academy, University of Utah and one other member institution.

Intent: To establish an exception provision to Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3) that would include participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 79 TRANSFER RULE—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(13), page 102, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(13) If the student transfers to a Division III member institution from a Division I or, Division II or **nonmember four-year institution** after competing in that sport at the previous institution provided the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a student who transfers to a Division III institution from a nonmember four-year institution after competing at the previous institution to be immediately eligible if the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the previous institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Governance

NO. 80 DIVISION I-AAA

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(a), page 127, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. (a) Determination of Divisions. Each active member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may permit an institution's women's athletics program to be classified in a division other than its membership division if it deems that unusual circumstances

warrant such action. *In the sport of football only, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A, and Division I-AA and Division I-AAA, and the membership of these subdivisions* Divisions I-A and I-AA shall be so designated in the sport of football and Division I-AAA shall include all other Division I members. Divisions I-A and I-AA shall vote separately on legislative issues that pertain only to the sport of football. In addition, *the membership of Division I-A and the remainder of the membership* each subdivision of Division I may vote separately on any issue in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6, 5-7, 6-5-(e), 7-1-(b) and other Bylaw 7 legislation pertaining to basketball, 11-1-(a) through (e), 11-4 and the definition of commonly accepted educational expenses."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(h), page 137, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Members of *Division I-A and all other Division I members* the subdivisions (Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I- AAA) of Division I may vote separately on any issue in the bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6, 5-7, 6-5-(e), 7-1-(b) and other Bylaw 7 legislation pertaining to basketball, 11-1-(a) through (e), 11-4, and the definition of commonly accepted educational expenses. A bylaw provision adopted by either Division I-A, or by the other Division I members Division I-AA or Division I-AAA may be rescinded by a majority vote of all members of Division I present and voting."

C. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 7, pages 44-46, by adding new paragraph (d), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) There may be an annual legislative meeting of Division I-AAA during June or August, at which the Division I-AAA membership may adopt legislation applicable only to Division I-AAA and may propose legislation on other matters for consideration by the subsequent annual Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-AAA legislative meeting shall become effective immediately upon adjournment of the subsequent annual Convention, subject to the conditions of the special rules of order and subject to the rescission provisions of the bylaws [Bylaw 11-1-(h), Bylaw 13-1-(h) and O.I. 1300]."

Source: Cleveland State University, DePaul University, Georgia State University, Marquette University, Stetson University, University of Vermont and five other member institutions.

Intent: To permit legislative autonomy for Division I-AAA in the divided bylaws, except for the provisions specified in the legislation, and to establish an annual legislative meeting of Division I-AAA members during the summer to be scheduled at the discretion of those members. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to reflect this legislation in other related provisions.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 81 CONVENTION COMMITTEES—NOMINEES

A. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 2-(g)-(4), page 146, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The committees shall present to the business session at least two nominees for *vacancies each vacancy* on all men's and women's sports committees, respectively, as provided in Bylaws 12-4 and 12-5. The committee shall circulate requests for nominees for all vacancies to all members of the Association and shall mail a copy of its proposed nominees to all members not later than November 22 preceding an annual Convention."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 2-(h)-(5) and (6), page 147, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(5) The committee shall act as one body to nominate at least two candidates for president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, and to affirm the work of its division subunits, which shall act separately to recommend candidates for each Council vacancy within their respective divisions and for the office of division vice-president.

"(6) Each division subunit of the committee shall present to its division round table at the annual Convention *one or more at least two* nominees for each vacancy in the division's membership on the Council and *at least two nominees* for the office of division vice-president. The committee itself shall present to the business session of the annual Convention *one or more at least two* nominees for vacancies in the offices of president and secretary-treasurer, respectively. The committee shall circulate requests for nominees for all vacancies among the officers and on the Council to all members of the Association and shall mail a copy of its proposed nominees and their credentials to all members not later than November 22 preceding an annual Convention."

Source: University of Bridgeport; University of Iowa; Keene State College; Mary Baldwin College; St. Cloud State University; University of Texas, Austin, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To require the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee to nominate at least two candidates for each vacant position and to require those committees to circulate requests for nominees to the membership and to mail copies of their proposed nominees to the membership not later than November 22 each year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 82 VOTING—ICE HOCKEY

A. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 3, page 131, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A member institution classified in Division II or Division III that also is classified and participates in Division I ice hockey shall be permitted to vote on legislative issues directly affecting ice hockey at the Division I level."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 13, Section 1, page 163, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) An institution that is a member of a different division than its ice hockey classification shall vote on amendments pertaining to ice hockey in the division in which its ice hockey team is classified."

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To permit all Division I ice hockey-playing institutions to vote on Division I ice hockey legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 83 AMENDMENTS

A. **Constitution:** Amend Article 7, Section 1, page 51, by deleting paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) A voting member that is unable to obtain sponsorship of the required six active members, or that does not desire to seek such sponsorship, may submit a proposed amendment for consideration by the NCAA Council at its April, August or October meeting.

"(1) If the Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission votes to sponsor such an amendment, no further sponsorship is required.

"(2) If the Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission does not vote to sponsor the amendment, it will not be circularized to the membership unless verified sponsorship by six active members is received in accordance with the amendment deadlines."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 13, Section 1, page 162, by deleting paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A voting member that is unable to obtain sponsorship of the required six active members, or that does not desire to seek such sponsorship, may submit a proposed amendment for consideration by the NCAA Council at its April, August or October meeting.

"(1) If the Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission votes to sponsor such an amendment, no further sponsorship is required.

Intent: To remove involvement of the Council in the automatic review of amendments that have not received sponsorship by at least six active members.

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To remove involvement of the Council in the automatic review of amendments that have not received sponsorship by at least six active members.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 84 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2-(g)-(1), page 146, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Representation on each committee shall be based on the NCAA Council geographical representation regions set forth in Constitution 5-5(c). Six members of each committee shall be from Division I with not more than two from any Division I region, three from Division II with not more than one from any Division II region and three from Division III with not more than one from any Division III region."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To base membership on the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees on the NCAA Council geographical representation regions, rather than the NCAA districts.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 85 HIGH SCHOOL OR JUNIOR COLLEGE REPRESENTATION ON SPORTS COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4, pages 153-158, by deleting subparagraphs (a)-(5), (b)-(3), (c)-(3), (d)-(3), (f)-(3) and (4), (l)-(3), (m)-(3), and (q)-(3), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, and amending subparagraph (o)-(5), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(5) One member who shall represent junior college track and field interests and an An additional member who shall be secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate representatives of high school or junior college interests as members of NCAA sports committees.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 86 DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(j), page 160, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of four six members. One member shall be elected from each Division I-AA region and two members shall be elected at large, with conference representation limited to one member. In the event there are fewer than four regions, the additional member(s) shall be elected at large. The Division I-AA Football Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Division I-AA Football

Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee."

Source: All seven members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To increase the membership of the Division I-AA Football Committee from four to six.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

Personnel

NO. 87 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 118, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(a) Division I Football—One head coach and nine assistant coaches in Division I-A institutions; one head coach and eight seven assistant coaches and two part-time assistant coaches in Division I-AA institutions."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(g), page 113, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(g) If a Division I-AA member institution maintains eligibility rules that preclude freshmen from participating on the varsity intercollegiate football team and sponsors a separate freshman football team, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize three part-time coaches in the sport of football. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this subparagraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting and may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice seasons in the sport of football set forth in Bylaw 3. Such freshman teams must participate in five or more intercollegiate contests."

Source: Appalachian State University; University of Connecticut; Idaho State University; McNeese State University; University of Montana; University of Texas, Arlington, and one other member institution.

Intent: To reduce the number of full-time assistant coaches from eight to seven and to permit three part-time assistant coaches at institutions that preclude freshmen from competing on the varsity and sponsor separate freshman teams in Division I-AA football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986. An institution would be permitted to meet the limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance; however, effective August 1, 1986, no more than seven assistant coaches shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.

Action: Approved by Division I-AA as amended by No. 88. Later motion to reconsider defeated (28-59).

NO. 88 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 87-B, Bylaw 7-1-(g), as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(g) Division I-AA Football — The following numbers of part-time coaches are permitted in addition to the full-time coaches specified in Bylaw 7-1-(a):

"(1) If a Division I-AA member institution maintains eligibility rules that preclude freshmen from participating on the varsity intercollegiate football team and sponsors a separate freshman football team, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize three part-time coaches in the sport of football. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this subparagraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting and may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice seasons in the sport of football set forth in Bylaw 3. Such freshman teams must participate in five or more intercollegiate contests.

"(2) If a Division I-AA member institution sponsors a junior varsity intercollegiate football team in addition to varsity and freshman teams, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize two additional part-time coaches in the sport of football. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this subparagraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting. The junior varsity team must participate in four or more intercollegiate contests."

Source: Cornell University; Harvard University; McNeese State University; Princeton University; Southeastern Louisiana University, and the University of Texas, Arlington.

Action: Approved by Division I-AA.

NO. 89 GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 119, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching without being subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. **There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches in football and two in basketball.**

Source: Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University and two other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To limit the number of graduate assistant coaches in football and basketball in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 90 TRAVEL SQUAD LIMITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, page 120, by adding new Section 4, as follows:

[Division I-A only]

"Section 4. Travel Squad Limits. The limits on the number of travel squad members who can dress and compete in a game, contest or event shall be as follows:

Football **70"**

Source: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota and three other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To limit to 70 the number of Division I-A football players who can travel to an away-from-home game.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Withdrawn.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 91 LIMITATIONS ON PLAYING SEASONS AND NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), page 77, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A member institution shall limit its contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition in *the sports of basketball, football, ice hockey and soccer* **all sports** to the periods of time specified in this section."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(5), page 78, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(5) All other sports in Divisions I and II—September 1 or the first day of classes of the regular fall term of the institution, whichever occurs first. **All other sports in Division I—Traditional fall sports: September 1 or the first day of classes of the regular fall term of the institution, whichever occurs first. Traditional winter sports: October 15. Traditional spring sports: February 15.**

C. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 307, following Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(5), page 78, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 307. The 'traditional fall season' is the period from September 1 through the second Saturday in December. The 'traditional spring season' is the period from January 2 February 15 through the last day of

classes of the regular academic year at the institution, or the conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport, whichever occurs last. For the purposes of Bylaw 3-2-(b)- (5), 'traditional' fall sports are cross country, field hockey, women's volleyball and water polo [with limited schedules in baseball, golf, tennis and men's volleyball per Bylaws 3-3-(a)-(1) and 3-3-(a)-(2)]; 'traditional' winter sports are fencing, gymnastics, indoor track, rifle, skiing, swimming and wrestling [with a limited schedule in men's and women's volleyball per Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(2)]; 'traditional' spring sports are baseball, golf, lacrosse, outdoor track, men's volleyball, softball and tennis [with limited schedules in soccer and women's volleyball per Bylaws 3-3-(a)-(1) and 3-3-(a)-(2)]."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 79, incorporate paragraph (d), and delete paragraphs (e) and (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in the sport of basketball all sports shall not be played after the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship Game or the conclusion of the national governing body's championship in that sport. In the sport of football, the second Saturday in December is the last date on which a contest may be scheduled. In the sports of soccer and women's volleyball, per Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(2), postseason contests are permissible.

"(e) The last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in the sport of soccer shall not be played after the final day of classes of the regular academic year at the member institution.

"(f) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the last contest (game or scrimmage) or date of competition in a sport in Divisions I and II shall not take place after the last day of classes for the regular academic year at the institution, the conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport or the conclusion of the national governing body national championship in that sport, whichever occurs last."

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), pages 80-81, as follows:

[Division I only]

		"(1) Division I—Maximum number of contests:
Baseball	80	70 (with not more than 60 50 during the traditional spring season)
Ice Hockey	38	28
Soccer	22	19 (during the traditional fall season)"

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(2), page 81, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) Division I—Maximum number of dates of competition:

Golf	30	with not more than 25 during the traditional spring season)
Soccer	6	4 (subsequent to the traditional fall season)
Tennis	35	30 (With not more than 25 during the traditional spring season)
Volleyball	35	30 (with not more than 25 during the traditional

Volleyball 12 season)
 (subsequent to the traditional fall season for women and prior to the traditional spring season for men)"

G. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d), page 83, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) Postseason practice in soccer shall be prohibited after the regular academic year. After the close of the soccer season, as specified in Bylaw 3-2-(e), for purposes of this legislation, it It shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining in the sport of soccer to be employed as counselors in a soccer camp and to participate on an outside, amateur soccer team during the summer months. No more than six student-athletes from the same institution's soccer program may serve as counselors in the same summer camp, or participate on the same outside, amateur soccer team."

Source: James Madison University; Marshall University; University of Richmond; University of Tennessee, Chattanooga; Virginia Military Institute, and College of William and Mary.

Intent: To limit playing seasons in all sports, specifying playing seasons for all sports and identifying sports with their traditional seasons; to restrict further limitations on playing schedules in certain sports, and to permit soccer practice during the traditional spring sports season.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Referred to NCAA Council.

NO. 92 CONTEST LIMITS—FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 83, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(i) The following activities are excluded from the computation of individual and team contest limitations conditioned on the fact that student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of their participation:

"(1) Golf or tennis activities in which team members of that sport participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of an institution's athletics or other programs;

"(2) Individual and team sport activities in sports other than football or basketball in which athletes from more than one team participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of an institution's athletics or other programs;

"(3) The participation of individual athletes in local celebrity sports activities conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations as long as no more than two athletes from any one sport are participating in such activities."

Source: Central Michigan University, University of Georgia, University of

Houston, Keene State College, St. Cloud State University, Southern Methodist University and seven other member institutions.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to participate in fund-raising activities to benefit their institutions and local nonprofit organizations as long as those activities involve competition among and between athletes and alumni or friends, and no classes are missed as a result of participation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 93 LIMITATIONS ON PLAYING SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(5), page 78, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(5) All other sports in Divisions I and II—September 1 or the first day of classes of the regular fall term at the institution, whichever occurs first, **except that if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday, the first contest may be played on the Saturday or Sunday immediately preceding September 1.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 307, following Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(5), page 78, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“O.I. 307. The ‘traditional fall season’ is the period from September 1, **except that if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday, the first contest may be played on the Saturday or Sunday immediately preceding September 1,** through the second Saturday in December. The ‘traditional spring season’ is the period from January 2 through the first day of classes of the regular academic year at the institution or the conclusion of the NCAA championship in the sport, whichever occurs last.”

Source: All nine members of the Western Athletic Conference, seven members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit member institutions to begin the fall season on Saturday or Sunday prior to September 1 in those years in which September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved (Part A by Divisions I and II; Part B by all divisions).

NO. 94 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

A. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 309, following Bylaw 3-3-(c), page 82, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“O.I. 309. A ‘postseason tournament’ contest in basketball is one between teams that are not identified until the close of the preceding regular season, the term ‘postseason’ necessarily implying that the time of the event shall be after a regular season. If a conference conducts a regularly scheduled, *season-end*, single-elimination **championship tournament (or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament)**, which may include one additional

contest to determine third place, among some or all of its members, the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible regular-season contests as specified in this section and the tournament shall not be considered postseason. Institutions that tie for a conference championship may participate in a single-elimination play-off to determine the conference’s automatic entry in an NCAA tournament without the game or games being counted as a regular-season contest or postseason tournament.”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(d), page 82, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(d) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport shall exclude competition in one conference *season-end, championship tournament (or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament)* and the NCAA championships. In the sports of indoor and outdoor track and field, the limitations shall exclude competition in one conference *season-end championship* meet and the NCAA championships in each sport.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that a conference championship tournament or meet, or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic qualifier in a sport, need not be conducted at the end of the regular season in order to qualify for exclusion from the limitations on contests and dates of competition, except that the conference basketball tournament cited in O.I. 309 will continue to count as one of the permissible regular-season contests for each participating institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved (Part A by all divisions; Part B by Divisions I and II).

NO. 95 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 200, following Bylaw 2-2-(q), page 71, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“O.I. 200. An open date refers to a regular weekend playing date prior to the end of an institution’s regular football schedule on which an institution is not playing a game, or a date approved by a two-thirds majority of those Council members present and voting to enable an institution to assist financially in meeting an unforeseen hardship situation resulting directly from the institution’s intercollegiate athletics activities. A conference may conduct a conference championship football game (between two institutions whose identities would not be known prior to the beginning of the season) on an open date during the traditional fall season (per O.I. 307), **provided the date is scheduled the week prior to the first round of an NCAA football championship date and provided the date is listed on the schedule of all conference members, and all conference members participate in not more than 10 regularly scheduled football games.**”

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, Lock Haven University of

Pennsylvania, Millersville University of Pennsylvania, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and three other members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit member institutions of a football-playing conference that participate in a conference championship football game to participate in 11 other regularly scheduled football games under the prescribed conditions. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made in Bylaw 3.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 96 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in each sport in any one year to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) or dates of competition with outside competition set forth in this section. In the sport of tennis, a dual match or an individual singles and/or doubles tournament shall be considered a date of competition. **In the sport of skiing, a meet of not more than two days' duration shall be considered a date of competition.**"

Source: All seven members of the High Country Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify in reference to the limitation on dates of competition in the sport of skiing that the scheduling of multiple skiing events for individual participants on two different dates during a meet will be countable as one date of competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 97 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(2) and (4), page 81, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Soccer 6 **11** (subsequent to the traditional fall season)"

Source: Clemson University; Furman University; University of Maine, Orono; Seattle Pacific University; University of South Florida; U.S. Military Academy, and 12 other member institutions.

Intent: To increase from six to 11 the permissible number of soccer contests outside the traditional fall season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 98 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 83, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(i) In the sport of softball, each day of a tournament shall be counted as one contest, and no more than 10 tournaments may be scheduled in an academic year."

Source: Creighton University, University of Bridgeport, Stanford University, Northern Illinois University, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania and all seven members of the High Country Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that each day of a softball tournament shall be counted as one game and to limit the number of tournaments in which a team may participate during the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I (146-94); defeated by Division II (65-93). Later motion to reconsider in Division I defeated.

NO. 99 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(d), page 82, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(d) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport shall exclude competition in one conference season-end tournament and the NCAA championships. In this sports of indoor and outdoor track and field, the limitations shall exclude competition in one conference season-end meet and the NCAA championships in each sport. **In the sport of tennis, the limitations shall exclude competition in one conference tournament ad the intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association (ITCA) National Team Indoor Championships.**"

Source: California State University, Hayward; Southern Methodist University; Stanford University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas; Austin; Texas Christian University, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To allow competition after the conference tournament and exclude one conference tournament and the ITCA National Team Indoor Tennis Championships from counting against the maximum allowable playing dates in tennis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 100 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 80, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Baseball	80 (with not more than 60 during the traditional spring season)
"Softball	60 (to be played during the traditional spring season)
	60 (to be played during the traditional spring season)"

Source: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa,

University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota and three other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To reduce the number of permissible baseball games in Division I from 80 to 60, and to provide that the permissible baseball and softball games in Division I be played during the traditional spring season only.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 101 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(3), page 81, as follows:

[Division II only]

"Baseball 60 80 (with not more than 60 during the traditional spring season)"

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association, all seven members of the Sunshine State Conference and seven other Division II member institutions.

Intent: To increase the maximum number of contests in the sport of baseball in Division II from 60 to 80, with not more than 60 during the traditional spring season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II (74-69).

NO. 102 BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(1), page 78, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) Basketball—The fourth next-to-late Friday in November for members of Division I, and the Friday immediately preceding Thanksgiving for members of Divisions II and III, except as provided in Bylaw 3-2-(e)."

Source: All eight members of the Sun Belt Conference.

Intent: To specify that the first basketball contest for Division I member institutions shall not be played prior to the next-to-late Friday in November.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 103 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 82, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(b) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage, the National Football Foundations benefit game and postseason game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2). Division I-A members also may participate in Japan in the Mirage Bowl game without counting such competition against the maximum number of contests, it

being understood that the same institution may not participate in such competition more than once in any four-year period."

Source: Boston College, University of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Notre Dame, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Military Academy and three other member institutions.

Intent: To exclude from the maximum number of contests in football a Division I-A member's participation in the Mirae Bowl.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 104 ICE HOCKEY PLAYING SEASON

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, page 80, by adding new paragraph (l), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(l) One ice hockey game may be played on the first Saturday of October between two Division I intercollegiate teams at the U.S. Hockey Hall of Fame."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 83, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) The one ice hockey game permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(l) shall not be considered a 'contest' in computing the maximum number of permissible ice hockey contests."

forth in this section. In the sport of tennis, a dual match or an individual singles and/or doubles tournament shall be considered a date of competition. In the sport of skiing, a meet of not more than two days' duration shall be considered a date of competition."

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To permit continuation of the practice of conducting one intercollegiate ice hockey game at the annual enshrinement activities at the U.S. Hockey Hall of Fame.

Effective Date: August 1, 1986.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Amateurism

NO. 105 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—ATHLETICS CAREER COUNSELING

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), page 15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are tutoring expenses, athletics medical insurance, death and dismemberment

insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletics competition and practice, and counseling about a future professional athletics career through a **three-person panel of at least three persons** appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department). **No more than one such panel member may be an athletics department staff member and all other panel members must be selected by the institution** from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department. **and All panel members shall be identified to the NCAA national office.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Intent: To permit more flexibility in the composition of the institutional panels responsible for providing counseling for student-athletes about future professional athletics careers.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 106 AMATEURISM—AGENTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), pages 10-11, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Any individual who contracts or who has ever contracted orally or in writing to be represented by an agent in the marketing of the individual's athletics ability or reputation in a sport no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. An agency contract not specifically limited in writing to a particular sport or particular sports shall be deemed applicable to all sports. Securing advice from a lawyer concerning a proposed professional sports contract shall not be considered contracting for representation by an agent under this rule unless the lawyer also represents the student-athlete in negotiations for such a contract. **A proposed contract also may be reviewed by an authorized institutional career counseling panel, which may meet with the student-athlete and representatives of professional teams.** Any individual, agency or organization representing a prospective student-athlete for compensation in placing the prospect in a collegiate institution as a recipient of athletically related financial aid shall be considered an agent or organization marketing the athletics ability or reputation of the individual."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Intent: To permit institutional counseling panels to review proposed contracts and meet with enrolled student-athletes and representatives of professional teams.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 107 DRUG REHABILITATION EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), page 15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in

intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are tutoring expenses, athletics medical insurance, **drug rehabilitation expenses**, death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletics competition and practice, and counseling about a future professional athletics career through a three-person panel appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department) from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department and identified to the NCAA national office."

Source: NCAA Council (Special NCAA Committee on National Drug-Testing Policy).

Intent: To permit member institutions to pay drug-rehabilitation expenses for student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 108 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—CAREER COUNSELING

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), page 15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are tutoring expenses, athletics medical insurance, death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletics competition and practice, **on-campus student development and career counseling utilizing sources from outside the institution**, and counseling about a future professional athletics career through a three-person panel appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department) from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department and identified to the NCAA national office."

Source: Clemson University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of Virginia; Wake Forest University, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide on-campus counseling services related to the personal growth and development of student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 109 SPORTS FESTIVAL TRYOUT EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(3), page 15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in national championship events; Olympic, Pan American and World University Games qualifying competition; **USOC National Sports Festival tryouts**,

or bona fide amateur competition during the Christmas and spring vacations as listed on the institution's official calendar."

Source: University of Bridgeport; University of Florida; University of Iowa; Northern Illinois University; Stanford University; University of Texas, Austin, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit member institutions to pay the actual and necessary expenses of enrolled student-athletes to participate in official tryouts for the USOC-sponsored National Sports Festival.

Effective Date: September 1, 1986.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 110 COMMERCIAL LOGOS

Constitution: Amend Case No. 41, pages 267-268, relating to Constitution 3-1-(e), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: A student-athlete desires to use athletics equipment or wear athletics apparel that bears the trademark or logo of an athletics equipment or apparel manufacturer or distributor in athletics competition.

"Question: Is the eligibility of the student-athlete jeopardized?

"Answer: No, provided that, in the case of athletics equipment (e.g., shoes, helmets, baseball bats and gloves, hockey and lacrosse sticks, goggles, and skis), the item bears only the manufacturer's normal label or trademark as it is used on all such items for sale to the general public and, in the case of the student-athlete's institution's official uniform (including warm-ups, socks, headbands, T-shirts, wristbands, visors, hats, swim caps, towels, knee pads, etc.), the clothing (if purchased or acquired subsequent to November 7, 1983) bears only a single manufacturer's or distributor's normal label or trademark not to exceed a one and one-half inch square in size. *All other items of apparel (e.g., socks, headbands, T-shirts, wristbands, visors or hats, swim caps and towels) may not include any visible commercial identification.*"

Source: University of Bridgeport, University of Idaho, Mary Baldwin College, University of New Haven, Stanford University and all seven members of the High Country Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the prohibition of logos on socks, headbands, T-shirts, wristbands, visors, hats, swim caps, towels, knee pads, etc., and to impose the same logo size restrictions as apply to other items related to the uniform.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated (343-205); two-thirds majority required).

NO. 111 RECRUITING—ADVERTISEMENTS FOR SUMMER CAMPS

Bylaws: Review Council interpretation; Bylaws 1-1-(b), 1-4-(a) and 1-9-(a); Case No. 186, as follows.

[All divisions, common vote]

"Under the provisions of Case No. 186 (page 309, 1985-86 NCAA Manual), member institutions or conferences may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials (e.g., periodicals designed to analyze recruiting activities) for any purpose whatsoever. This prohibition would extend to advertisements regarding member institutions' summer camps or clinics."

Source: University of Texas, Austin.

Action: Withdrawn.

Appendix B

80th Annual Convention

Nominating Committee

Chair—Jack V. Doland

- I-1—Edward Leland, Dartmouth College
- I-1—Nelson E. Townsend, Delaware State College
- I-2—Francis W. Bonner, Furman University
- I-2—Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
- I-3—June B. Davis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
- I-3—Edward J. Manetta Jr., DePaul University
- I-4—Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University
- I-4—Fred Jacoby, Southwest Athletic Conference
- II-1—Edward P. Markey, St. Michael's College
- II-2—Sandra T. Shuler, North Carolina Central University
- II-3—James R. Spalding, Bellarmine College
- II-4—Robert J. Hiegert, California State University, Northridge
- III-1—Charles Luce, Connecticut College
- III-2—Patricia A. Rogers, State University of New York, Albany
- III-3—Milton E. Reece, Greensboro College
- III-4—Russell J. Poel, North Central College

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—Howard Elwell

- District 1—Robert E. Hartwell, Babson College
- District 2—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
- District 3—Kenneth A. Free, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
- District 4—James W. Lessig, Mid-American Athletic Conference
- District 5—Noel W. Olson, North Central Conference
- District 6—Michael Johnson, University of Houston
- District 7—C. Arnold Ferrin Jr., University of Utah
- District 8—Norman B. Jones, Utah State University
- At Large—Allen F. Ackerman, Elmhurst College
- At Large—Dennis L. Keihn, California State University, Los Angeles
- At Large—Roy F. Kramer, Vanderbilt University
- At Large—John L. Spring, Oswego State University College

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Mary Roby

- District 1—Mary Lou Thimas, Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts)
- District 2—P. LaVerne Sweat, Hampton Institute
- District 3—Marjorie T. Berkley, Hollins College
- District 4—Karen L. Womack, Miami University (Ohio)
- District 5—Rosemary Fri, University of Northern Colorado
- District 6—Jeannine McHaney, Texas Tech University
- District 7—Margie H. McDonald, High Country Athletic Conference
- District 8—Kay Don, California State University, Long Beach

- At Large—Eve Atkinson, Temple University
- At Large—Betty Kelly Austin, Alabama A&M University
- At Large—Sheila Brewer, Macalester College
- At Large—Mary Roby, University of Arizona

Voting Committee

Chair—Donald G. Combs

- District 1—William P. Holowaty, Eastern Connecticut State University
- District 2—Richard B. Yoder, West Chester University of Pennsylvania
- District 3—Lloyd C. Johnson, Bethune-Cookman College
- District 4—Clarence Underwood, Big Ten Conference
- District 5—Betty A. Hoff, Luther College
- District 6—Sadie Allison, Stephen F. Austin State University
- District 7—W. Harold Godwin, University of Idaho
- District 8—Chris Voelz, University of Oregon
- At Large—Donald G. Combs, Eastern Kentucky University
- At Large—Leanne Grotke, California State University, Fullerton
- At Large—James I. Tarman, Pennsylvania State University

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Darrell J. Peck

- Charles A. Eberle, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
- Darrell J. Peck, Buena Vista College
- Nancy M. Vedral, Northern Illinois University

Credentials Committee

Chair—Jane Gross

- Joseph W. Curtis, Mississippi Valley State University
- Jane Goss, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
- Frank Mach, College of St. Thomas

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1987 Convention

Town and Country, San Diego, California, January 7-9

Appendix C

NCAA Convention Sites, 1949-1986

	(Hotels in parentheses.)
43rd	1949 San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950 New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951 Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952 Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953 Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954 Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955 New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956 Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957 St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958 Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959 Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960 New York City (Astor)
55th	1961 Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962 Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963 Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964 New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965 Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966 Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967 Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968 New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969 Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970 Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971 Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972 Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973 Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973 Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974 San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975 Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975 Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976 St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976 St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977 Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978 Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979 San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980 New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981 Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981 St. Louis, Missouri (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982 Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983 San Diego, California (Town and Country)
78th	1984 Dallas, Texas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985 Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985 New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986 New Orleans (Hilton)

NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943, and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January. The 1st and 2nd special Conventions were held in August. The 3rd special Convention was held immediately prior to the 70th Convention in January. The 4th special Convention was held in December. The 5th special Convention was held in June.

Appendix D

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President	
1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Phillip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972	Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee
1973-1974	Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
1975-1976	John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
1977-1978	J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
1979-1980	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1981-1982	James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1983-1984	John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
1985-	John R. Davis, Oregon State University

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John J. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972	Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia

* Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Teachers College

1973-1974	Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
1975-1976	Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
1977-1978	Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
1979-1980	James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1981-1982	John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
1983-1984	John R. Davis, Oregon State University
1985-	Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984	Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
1985-	Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University

Division II Vice-President

1983	Edwin W. Lawrence, Cheyney State University
1984-1985	Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President

1983	Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
1984-1985	Elizabeth A. Kruczak, Fitchburg State College

Appendix E

Index to Legislative Proposals

Note: The following index to the legislative proposals contained in this publication is offered for convenience of reference in locating amendments affecting certain portions of the Association's existing legislation. The left-hand listing is in the order in which the amendments would be placed in the NCAA Manual. The second column presents the proposal numbers in this publication which would affect each of the references in the left-hand column. The third column then lists the page numbers in this book on which those proposals appear.

Legislative Reference	Proposal Numbers	Page Numbers
Constitution		
C 3-1-O.I. 2 [new]	No. 26-A	A-18
C 3-1-(c)	No. 106	A-70
C 3-1-(e)-Case 41	No. 110	A-72
C 3-1-(g)-(1)	No. 22-A	A-15
C 3-1-(h)-(3)	No. 109	A-71
C 3-1-(h)-(4)	Nos. 105, 107, 108	A-69, A-70, A-71
C 3-3-(b)-(2)	No. 76	A-53
C 3-4-(a)-(4)	No. 27	A-20
C 3-4-(b)	No. 25	A-18
C 3-4-(b)-(1)	No. 26-B	A-19
C 3-4-(d), (e)	No. 22-B	A-15
C 3-4-(d)-(2)-(iv)	Nos. 23, 24	A-17, A-18
C 3-4-(d)-(3)	No. 28	A-20
C 3-6-(b) [new]	No. 30-A	A-22
C 3-9-(i)	No. 30-B	A-22
C 4-2-(a)-O.I. 11	No. 19-A	A-12
C 4-2-(g)-(2) [new]	No. 55	A-41
C 4-2-(h) [new]	Nos. 32, 33	A-27
C 5-2-(a)-(3)	No. 1	A-1
C 5-7-(d) [new]	No. 80-C	A-55
C 6-4-(b)	No. 36-A	A-29
C 7-1-(c)	No. 83-A	A-57
C 7-1-(d)	No. 36-B	A-29
Bylaws		
B 1-1-(b)-(4) [new]	No. 48	A-37
B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(i), [new] (ii)	No. 43	A-32
B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(iii)	No. 42	A-32
B 1-2-(a)-(6)-(v) [new]	No. 54	A-40
B 1-2-(a)-(7) [new]	No. 44-A	A-33
B 1-2-(b)	No. 40	A-31
B 1-3-(d) [new]	No. 41	A-31
B 1-4-(b)	No. 3	A-3
B 1-4-(c)	No. 53	A-40
B 1-6-(a), (b), (c)	No. 46	A-34
B 1-6-(c)	No. 26-C	A-20

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>	<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
B 1-6-(f) [new]	No. 51	A-39	B 7-1-(g)	No. 87-B, 88	A-59
B 1-7 [new]	No. 47	A-36	B 7-1-(h)	No. 89	A-60
B 1-8-(a)	No. 44-B	A-33	B 7-4 [new]	No. 90	A-61
B 1-8-(f)	Nos. 50, 52	A-38, A-39	B 9-5-(f) [new]	No. 34	A-28
B 1-8-(g)	No. 49	A-38	B 10-1-(a)	No. 80-A	A-54
B 2-2-(f)	No. 30-C	A-22	B 10-3-(b)	No. 66	A-48
B 2-2-(i)	No. 39	A-30	B 10-3-(b)-(1)	No. 67	A-48
B 2-2-(q)-O.I. 200	No. 95	A-65	B 10-3-(c) [new]	No. 82-A	A-56
B 3-2-(a)	No. 91-A	A-61	B 10-4-(c)	No. 64	A-46
B 3-2-(b)-(1)	No. 102	A-68	B 10-6-(c)-(e) [new]	No. 65	A-47
B 3-2-(b)-(5)	Nos. 91-B, 93-A	A-61, A-64	B 11-1-(b)	No. 57	A-42
B 3-2-(b)-(5)-O.I. 307	Nos. 91-C, 93-B	A-61, A-64	B 11-1-(f) [new]	No. 58	A-42
B 3-2-(c), (e), (f)	No. 91-D	A-62, A-69	B 11-1-(f)-(1)	Nos. 59, 60	A-43
B 3-2-(l) [new]	No. 104-A	A-69	B 11-1-(h)	No. 80-B	A-55
B 3-3-(a)	No. 96	A-66	B 11-2-(b)	No. 61	A-44
B 3-3-(a)-(1)	Nos. 91-E, 100	A-62, A-67	B 11-3-(b) [new]	Nos. 62, 63-A	A-44
B 3-3-(a)-(2)	Nos. 91-F, 97	A-62, A-66	B 11-4 [new]	No. 63-B	A-45
B 3-3-(a)-(3)	No. 101	A-68	B 11-4-(b) and (2)	No. 56	A-41
B 3-3-(a)-(4)	No. 97	A-67	B 11-4-(b)-(2)	No. 8	A-5
B 3-3-(b)	No. 103	A-68	B 12-2-(g)-(1)	No. 84	A-58
B 3-3-(c)-O.I. 309	Nos. 4, 94-A	A-3, A-64	B 12-2-(g)-(4)	No. 81-A	A-56
B 3-3-(d)	Nos. 5, 94-B, 99	A-3, A-64, A-67	B 12-2-(h)-(5), (6)	No. 81-B	A-56
B 3-3-(g), (h), [new] (i)	No. 20-A	A-13	B 12-3-(l)	No. 9	A-5
B 3-3-(i) [new]	Nos. 92, 98, 104-B	A-63, A-66, A-69	B 12-3-(u)	No. 10	A-6
B 3-4-(d)	No. 91-G	A-63	B 12-3-(x)	No. 11	A-6
B 3-6-(b)-(8) [new]	No. 20-B	A-13	B 12-4-(a)-(5)	No. 85	A-58
B 4-1-(b)-(3) [new]	No. 77	A-53	B 12-4-(b)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(d) and (2)	No. 68	A-49	B 12-4-(c)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(d)-(1)	No. 69	A-50	B 12-4-(d)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(d)-(3)	No. 78	A-53	B 12-4-(f)-(3), (4)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(i)	No. 19-B	A-11	B 12-4-(g)-(1)	No. 12	A-7
B 5-1-(j)-Note	Nos. 6, 14, 15, 16	A-4, A-7, A-8, A-9	B 12-4-(l)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iv) [new]	No. 17	A-10	B 12-4-(m)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(j)-(7)	No. 74	A-52	B 12-4-(o)-(5)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(l)-(2) [new]	No. 26-D	A-19	B 12-4-(q)-(3)	No. 85	A-58
B 5-1-(m)-(13)	No. 79	A-54	B 12-5-(j)	No. 86	A-58
B 5-1-(m)-(14)	No. 70	A-50	B 13-1-(c)	No. 83-B	A-57
B 5-1-(m)-(14)-(ii)	No. 71	A-51	B 13-1-(d)	No. 36-C	A-29
B 5-1-(m)-(14)-(v)	Nos. 72, 73	A-51	B 13-1-(i) [new]	No. 82-B	A-57
B 5-1-(m)-(14)-(vi)	No. 7	A-5	Special Rules of Order		
B 5-1-(n)-(3) [new]	No. 75	A-52	SR 2-(a), (b)	No. 2	A-2
B 5-2 [new]	No. 30-D	A-23	Executive Regulations		
B 5-6	No. 37	A-29	ER 1-1-(d) [new]	No. 13	A-7
B 5-6-(e)-(4)	No. 18	A-10	ER 1-1-(f)	No. 38	A-30
B 6-1 [old]	No. 22-C	A-15	ER 1-7 [new]	No. 30-E	A-23
B 6-1 [new]	No. 22-D	A-16	ER 1-9-(a)	No. 30-F	A-25
B 6-3-(c)-O.I. 600	No. 29	A-21	ER 1-10-(a)	No. 30-G	A-25
B 7-1-(a)	No. 87-A	A-59	ER 4-3	No. 30-H	A-25

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
Enforcement Procedure		
EP 10	No. 35	A-28
Resolutions		
Enforcement and Compliance	No. 21	A-14
Gambling	No. 31	A-26
Recruiting Contact Limits	No. 45	A-33

